

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

CONTENTS

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.
PAGE

JUDSON, A. C.—Mother Hubbard's Ape,	145
MANNING, C. A.—The 'Two Brothers' of Lermontov and Pechorin,	149
WILLIAMSON, EDWARD.—Tasso's Annotations to Triassino's Poetics,	153
WILLIAMSON, EDWARD.—An Unpublished Tasso Sonnet,	158
STORER, M. E.—French Women Members of the Ricovrati of Padua,	161
MORRISSETTE, B. A.—Richard Aldington's Proposed "Source" for 'La Princesse de Clèves,'	164
OAKE, R. B.—'De l'Esprit des Lois,' Books XXVI-XXXI,	167
EVANS, D. O.—The Hegelian Idea in 'Hernani,'	171
NIESS, R. J.—Julien Benda and Hugues Rebell,	174
LIEVSAY, J. L.—The "D. T." Poems in Overbury's 'A Wife,'	177
GILBERT, A. H.—The Embleme for December in the 'Shepherd's Calendar,'	181
COMBS, H. C.—Habington's 'Castara' and the Date of His Marriage,	182
ALLEN, D. C.—Cowley's Pindar,	184
DUFFY, CHARLES.—W. E. Leonard's Annotations in a Copy of 'Poems 1916-1917,'	185
SCHOECK, R. J.—T. S. Eliot, Mary Queen of Scots, and Guillaume de Machaut,	187
KANE, R. J.—A. E. Housman and the New Prefect of the Ambrosian,	189
GILBERT, A. H.—Ovid's Mulberry in Milton's 'Pro Se Defensio,'	190

REVIEWS:—

D. BUSH, English Literature in the Seventeenth Century, 1600-1660. [M. F. Hughes.]	190
I. J. SEMPER, <i>Hamlet</i> without Tears; H. GRANVILLE-BARKER, Prefaces to Shakespeare. [M. A. Shaaber.]	194
F. J. CARMODY (ed.), <i>Li Compilacions de le science des estoilles</i> , by LEOPOLD OF AUSTRIA. [R. Levy.]	197
A. BARBIER (ed.), <i>Poèmes</i> . Par P. DE RONSARD; J. LAVAUD (ed.), <i>Sonnets pour Hélène</i> . Par P. DE RONSARD. [M. Frangon.]	200
C. C. BRADY, The Works of Claude Boyer. [H. C. Lancaster.]	202
S. D. BRAUN, The 'Courtisane' in the French Theatre from Hugo to Becque (1831-1885); W. D. PENDELL, Victor Hugo's Acted Dramas and the Contemporary Press. [G. B. Fitch.]	204
D. C. ALLEN (ed.), <i>Essays</i> by Sir William Cornwallis, the Younger. [A. M. Witherspoon.]	206
H. F. FLETCHER (ed.), John Milton's Complete Poetical Works. [M. Kelley.]	208
M. T. HERRICK, The Fusion of Horatian and Aristotelian Literary Criti- cism, 1531-1555. [V. Hall, Jr.]	209
C. N. GREENOUGH and J. M. FRENCH, A Bibliography of the Theophrastian Character in English; B. BOYCE, The Theophrastian Character in England to 1642. [D. C. Allen.]	211
J. CASALDUERO, Jorge Guillén: <i>Cántico</i> . [K. Whittredge.]	212
B. A. MACKENZIE, Shakespeare's Sonnets. [O. Hinman.]	213
K. B. TAFT (ed.), Minor Knickerbockers. [H. E. Spivey.]	214
BRIEF MENTION: H. H. CLARK and N. FOERSTER (eds.), James Russell Lowell; M. L. DUFRENOY, <i>L'Orient romanesque en France 1704- 1789</i> . T. II,	215
CORRESPONDENCE: Footnote on Calderón, Ravenscroft, and Boursault; Reply,	217

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMAYER
RAYMOND D. HAVENS
KEMP MALONE

C. S. SINGLETON
CHARLES R. ANDERSON
DON CAMERON ALLEN

Advisory Editors

E. Feise, Grace Frank, J. C. French, T. Malakis, R. B. Rouleston, Pedro Salinas,
Arno Schirokauer, L. Spitzer

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$5.00
for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries
included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are not used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNB.*, *JEGP.*, *MLN.*, *MLR.*, *MP.*, *NED.*, *PMLA.*, *PQ.*, *RR.*, *SP.*, *RNS.*, *TLS.* Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Maryland.



IMPROVE YOUR FRENCH IN BEAUTIFUL, OLD-WORLD SURROUNDINGS at MCGILL UNIVERSITY FRENCH SUMMER SCHOOL MONTREAL, CANADA JUNE 29 to AUGUST 11

Perfect your French, for professional use or for business or pleasure, in the natural, attractive French atmosphere of McGill's popular, long-established French Summer School at Montreal—in the heart of Old-World French Canada. Ideal study, conversational, residential course for teachers, students, and business people; also for advanced students of good intellectual ability who aim at graduate work in McGill. French alone spoken at all times in residence. Tuition is of unusually high standards by experienced French university teachers. Resident scholarships and university credit certificates. Co-educational. Comfortable accommodation, interesting social amenities.

Fee (board, residence and tuition)—\$220.

Write now for prospectus to:

(DIRECTOR), FRENCH SUMMER SCHOOL

MCGILL UNIVERSITY
MONTREAL, CANADA.

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1108,
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

Modern Language Notes

Volume LXIII

MARCH, 1948

Number 3

MOTHER HUBBERD'S APE

Virtually all agree that the account of the second court in Spenser's *Mother Hubberds Tale* contains personal satire, and that the Fox represents Lord Burghley. But who is the Ape? The late Professor Edwin A. Greenlaw decided he was Jehan de Simier, agent of the duke of Alençon, who came to England in order to promote the duke's marriage with the queen.¹ Dr. Harold Stein concluded that he was James VI of Scotland.² Professor Brice Harris identified him with Sir Robert Cecil, son of the great treasurer.³

In my recent life of Spenser I accepted Greenlaw's view that the Ape concerned the French marriage, though I by no means accepted all Greenlaw's conclusions:⁴ I do not believe that the poem circulated in manuscript (except perhaps among a few of Spenser's most intimate friends), or that Leicester necessarily ever saw it, or that we should assume it occasioned Spenser's going to Ireland with Grey. Greenlaw thought that the manuscript was "called in," but Stein has clearly demonstrated that it was the printed version (1591) that was recalled from circulation. Several reviewers regret my failure to explain more fully why I prefer Greenlaw's identification of the Ape. The thoughtful discussions of Stein and Harris deserved far more attention than the brief note I accorded them. For my brevity I can offer no better excuse than a determination to cut to the bone arguments on controversial issues. I shall try to make some amends here.

¹ *PMLA*, xxv (1910), 535-561.

² *Studies in Spenser's Complaints*, 1934, 78-100.

³ *Huntington Library Quarterly*, iv (1940-1941), 191-203.

⁴ Variorum Edition, *Life*, pp. 68-71; 153-155.

The first half of the poem, with its general satire of the three estates, is clearly early work. Spenser says so, and his assertion goes unquestioned. But why did he send his Fox and Ape to court for a second time? Greenlaw believed that the proposed French marriage, of which Spenser, like his friend Sidney, must have bitterly disapproved, induced him to add this prediction of what would happen if the young Catholic duke became, with the council's sanction, Elizabeth's consort.⁵

Simier, Alençon's master of the wardrobe, arrived in London on January 5, 1579, to be followed by the duke in August. Simier charmed Elizabeth, who called him her "monkey"; and Alençon's suit progressed with every promise of success so far as Elizabeth's attitude toward her "frog," as she termed Alençon, was concerned. But the public was outraged. By the following January, 1580, Elizabeth's interest in the affair had subsided.⁶

In Greenlaw's opinion, as we have seen, the Ape is to be taken as Simier, or possibly a fusion of Alençon and Simier. The extreme danger in making public such a satire must, on reflection, have been evident even to so rash and impulsive a young man as Spenser. But the work was clearly a masterpiece and would be carefully preserved. When, ten years later, Burghley (as Spenser was convinced) blocked his preferment, the poem, then comparatively innocuous in so far as the French marriage was concerned, seems to have been revised for inclusion in the *Complaints*. Two passages were, I believe, interpolated at this time, lines 891-918, which describe the distress of a suitor waiting in vain for preferment at court, and lines 1137-1224, in which Burghley is harshly attacked for his shameful enriching of himself and his sons while denying soldiers, scholars, and others their proper rewards, and preventing their access to the queen. In each of these passages the difference in tone and the interruption of the flow of the narrative are evident. Readers in 1591 might very well have wondered vaguely who the Ape was, but they could have had no doubt concerning the identity of the Fox and his cubs.

Let us now consider the arguments against this hypothesis.

1. Stein and Harris both believe that the account of the second court was written in 1590. Stein emphasizes the absence of refer-

⁵ Spenser's loathing of the scheme may apparently be read in the Braggadocchio-Trompart-Belphebe episode in *The Faerie Queene*, II, iii.

⁶ Variorum Edition, *Life*, pp. 55-58.

ences to *Mother Hubberds Tale* earlier than 1591. To me this is an indication that the second court, like the first, was early, not late, work. The first part could have been circulated, and would probably have been mentioned with pride in the Spenser-Harvey correspondence, but not after the dangerous second part had been added.

2. Stein reminds us of Harvey's statement in 1592 that "Mother Hubbard, in heat of choller, forgetting the pure sanguine of her sweete Feary Queene, wilfully over-shott her malcontented selfe." "Harvey is so direct," says Stein, "in his placing of *Mother Hubberds Tale* after *The Faerie Queene* that by itself his statement would seem to dispose of any theory like Professor Greenlaw's. . . ." But Harvey is surely not concerned with the date of *composition* of *Mother Hubberds Tale*, but of *publication*. And it was of course published after *The Faerie Queene*.

3. Convinced that the second court was added in 1590, Stein looks for a representative for the Ape. This task he finds difficult, indeed in a sense impossible, "for there is no situation in Burghley's career which parallels that in *Mother Hubberds Tale*." He concludes that the most likely candidate is James VI, whose aspirations in the matter of the succession were well known in England at this time. But James, a Protestant and the presumptive heir to the throne, was favored by Essex and Walsingham even more than by Burghley.⁷ There is no reason to believe that Spenser would have opposed him.

4. Harris offers two objections to the Ape as Alençon: "first, the Ape must be a genuine usurper of power, and not merely a prince consort." Yet how could Spenser and his friends know that the young prince consort might not become a power behind the throne?

5. Harris has "studied a large number of beast-satires written during the hundred years after *Mother Hubberds Tale*" without once finding a beast that represents two people. Perhaps Spenser intended the Ape for Alençon alone; or again Spenser may have been thinking merely of the French marriage, with all it implied; or caution may have prompted him to let Simier represent his master.

⁷ Conyers Read, *Mr. Secretary Walsingham and the policy of Queen Elizabeth*, 1925, III, 339-342; Helen Georgia Stafford, *James VI of Scotland and the Throne of England*, [1940], p. 50.

6. Harris places much weight on a passage in *A Declaration of the True Causes of the Great Troubles, Presupposed to be Intended against the Realme of England* (1592). Here there is a reference to "the false fox and his crooked cubbes" in *Mother Hubberds Tale*. But is this any more than an allusion to Burghley and his sons (mentioned in ll. 1147-1158)? I see no reason to suppose that the Ape was in the author's mind.

7. "But the real key to the poem," writes Harris, "lies in the interpretation of Richard Niccols's *Beggars Ape*—a close imitation of *Mother Hubberds Tale*—written about 1607 and not published until 1627." Here the Fox represents Northampton; the Ape, Robert Cecil. Niccols, however, might very well adapt Spenser's poem to a satire on Robert Cecil without having any knowledge of Spenser's intentions many years before.

8. Harris considers the "equipage of forreine beasts" that protect the Fox and Ape to be "an obvious reference to the English spy service, which was composed chiefly of foreigners." These "warders strange," we are told, are all of "two kinds," as griffins, minotaurs, dragons, and even such amphibious creatures as the humble beaver. It would seem equally probable that we have here a description of the bodyguard or attendants that a foreign prince would bring in. In time they would seem neither English nor French but an odd mixture of the two.

9. Harris describes at length the fears that numerous persons entertained in 1590 that Burghley and his sons aimed at an almost kingly power. Spenser may have viewed the great power of Burghley and Sir Robert with apprehension, but I wonder how Spenser would have expected his readers to recognize Sir Robert Cecil in the Ape. They would surely have recognized Sir Robert as one of the Fox's cubs, especially in the lines referring to the lordships and might that almost broke the cubs' backs. As Harris says, we have here a glance at Sir Robert's deformity. But even in Spenser's loose type of allegory it would be odd for the Ape as well as the cubs to represent Sir Robert. The mere mention of the cubs would seem a hint to the reader that the Ape is some one else.

Harris remarks that it required bravery to challenge Greenlaw's widely accepted theory in regard to the Ape. That is true, but not because of the wide acceptance; rather, in my judgment, because Greenlaw's view seems to fit the facts so well. Arguments against it, on close examination, appear inconclusive.

Messrs. Stein and Harris both believe that Spenser was concerned less with his pension than with the welfare of the realm under the Cecils. I am quite ready to concede that in 1579 his main concern was the welfare of the realm. But in 1590, when the danger of a Catholic prince consort was past, I am certain that his own welfare loomed large. A passage referring to Burghley in *The Ruines of Time*, coupled with the transparent allusions in lines 1137-1224 to Burghley's greed and callous indifference to the deserts of soldiers and poets, gives ground for believing that Spenser's main concern in 1590-91 was a reward that he felt was his due. Early in 1590 Spenser addressed Burghley in a dedicatory sonnet, perhaps reluctantly yet with respect. It was only after months of exasperated cooling of his heels at the English court that he launched his amazingly outspoken attack.

If we bear in mind that Greenlaw's error in regard to the "calling in" of *Mother Hubberds Tale* in no sense invalidates the theory that Spenser's concern was over the French marriage, and if we recognize that we seem to have in the account of the second court an attack on Burghley's neglect of soldiers and poets superimposed, as it were, on an earlier expression of fear for England's welfare, we perceive that the difficulties with Greenlaw's identification of the Ape vanish.

A. C. JUDSON

Indiana University

THE TWO BROTHERS OF LERMONTOV AND PECHORIN

It is a commonplace for students of Lermontov to emphasize the autobiographical elements in his writings and especially in his dramas, for weak and strained as these often are, they deal for the most part with themes that certainly reflect to a greater or less degree the conflicts that went on between his father and his grandmother, who was trying to remove him as thoroughly as possible from his father's influence.

Yet the *Two Brothers* contains another factor of great importance in the poet's development, his love for Varvara Lopukhina, a friend of his childhood and later the wife of N. F. Bakhmetev. It is in this drama that for the first time we meet the figure of Vyera Ligovskaya, who was to give her name later to the unfinished

novel of the *Princess Ligovskaya* and also appears in the story Princess Mary in the *Hero of Our Time*. There seems little doubt that we can identify Varvara and Vyera, for we know that her marriage in 1835 called forth one of the poet's superficial sneers to cover the depth of his real feeling at the news and that within a year he had dashed off both the *Two Brothers* and the *Princess Ligovskaya* in his efforts to obtain a literary revenge and to soothe his injured feelings. This is made the more certain by his letter to S. A. Rayevsky on January 16, 1836, "I am writing the fourth act of a new drama, based on an event which happened to me in Moscow. O Moscow, Moscow, you acted very badly with me. I must explain to you first that I am in love." (Lermontov, academic edition, iv, 324). Unfortunately we do not know the details of this incident but it had apparently something to do with his call on the Bakhmetevs, when he was in Moscow on a leave of absence from his regiment around Christmas of the preceding year.

It was not at all unusual for Lermontov to rework the same theme several times, and even to incorporate long passages from earlier versions in the later. We need only to refer to the three poems, the *Confession*, *Boyar Orsha*, and *Mtsyri* for proof of this. We therefore should not be surprised if the various treatments of Vyera should show similarities and variations as the poet's mood fluctuated with time. Thus in the *Two Brothers*, Vyera, although she loves Yury, is still not technically guilty of unfaithfulness to her husband. The *Princess Ligovskaya* abruptly ends with Pechorin determined to make her unhappy. In the *Hero of Our Time* Vyera has definitely yielded to Pechorin on two separate occasions some years apart but her love for him is far more overwhelming and so in a strange way is his for her. (Cf. Manning, "Lermontov and the Character of Pechorin," *MLQ.*, vii, 100 ff.)

Once we accept the autobiographical significance of much of Lermontov's work, we have no difficulty in identifying the young and enthusiastic Yury of the *Two Brothers* and the Grigory Pechorin (nicknamed George by his family) of the other two tales with certain aspects of the author. This is done very clearly by M. A. Yakovlev (*M. Yu. Lermontov kak dramaturg*, Leningrad-Moscow, 1924, p. 157 ff.) who brings out the autobiographical influences in the play and gives them equal importance with the literary borrowings from Schiller's *Die Räuber* and still more strikingly from *Die Braut von Messina*.

However, the character of Alexander Radin, the other brother, is far harder to handle. Yakovlev argues that he is drawn from the character of Alekseyey Aleksandrovich Lopukhin, the brother of Varvara, who was an apparent rival of Lermontov's for the attentions of E. A. Sushkova in 1834. He admits however that there is no question that Alexander is portrayed like A. A. Lopukhin (*op. cit.*, p. 164). In view of this admission, we may fairly ask if much of his learning and study on the question of the prototype of Alexander is not irrelevant and hazard another explanation.

In this connection it is interesting that Alexander's approach to Vyera is closely paralleled by that of Pechorin to Princess Mary in the story of that name. More than that, Lermontov has repeated in *Princess Mary* (ed. Slovo, p. 373) almost verbatim the interview between Vyera and Alexander in Act Two of the *Two Brothers* (ed. Slovo, III, 340 f.). The scene in which this occurs offers one of the keys to the character of Alexander, just as it later serves as one of the leading passages in explaining the character of Pechorin and can be compared to the latter's confession to Maxim Maximych in *Bela* (ed. Slovo, IV, 286 ff.). It is not only a question of a formal transfer of one passage to another work. It is a definite sign that Lermontov has used Alexander to incarnate certain qualities that were later to form an integral part of the complex individual that was Pechorin. We can even say without fear of contradiction that the author has presented in Alexander one side of his own personality, even though it is not the most agreeable or admirable.

From his youthful days there was a strange dualism in Lermontov. Outwardly happy and successful, he seemed to be the prey of a strange demon whom he welcomed and under whose influence he gladly fell. Side by side with poems bewailing unrequited love are others which express the deepest cynicism and the assurance that love cannot exist among mortals. It would be too long to trace out all the ramifications of these themes but we can follow them through the writings of many years. The two sides of Lermontov's character which brought him to his tragic fate exist in the two brothers.

Yury is the gay and dashing young officer, who has easily won the affections of Vyera as a young girl. He has apparently made no move during his years of military service to maintain the relationship and he feels bitterly that she has married a rich man for

whom he has himself no respect. He is frank, open and attractive both in his virtues and his vices. He promises his father that he will respect Vyera's marriage as long as she does not take the first step to reopen the affair, but he will not promise more than he can be sure of accomplishing (*op. cit.*, p. 418). In fact he takes no action until Vyera's husband, deceived by his recital of his former love for her, tells him that the wife still loves him (p. 428).

On the other hand, Alexander is far less attractive. He has lived at home with his aged father and has met with rebuffs at every attempt to win those rewards which came so easily to his brother. When for a moment he had aroused the attention of Vyera, he had reached the summit of his happiness and his whole life was absorbed, colored and warped by this apparent success, even though he was fully aware that he was only taking his brother's place. As in the unfinished novel of Vadim, the hunchback hero had turned into an incarnation of a desire for revenge, so here Alexander lived only for his brief dream of love and to renew it, there was no action too petty, to mean or too contemptible. He had become in a real sense an evil spirit for himself, for Vyera, for his brother, and even for his father. He can boast at the end, "I forced out from the heart of Vyera everything that was like virtue in it, and nothing was left for you" (*op. cit.*, p. 461) and he can sneer of his brother, "A weak soul? . . . he could not endure this" (*op. cit.*, p. 461).

We can well understand then why so much of the material used in the character of Alexander was later incorporated in that of Pechorin, who was likewise both frank and secretive, who realized very clearly that he was misjudged by all (cf. ed. Slovo, iv, 405 f.) and yet could not and would not do anything to straighten his position in the eyes of society and the world. The frank sarcasm with which Lermontov greeted the marriage of Varvara could not hide from himself and his friends the depth of his feelings, the sense of betrayal by her whom he had regarded as his Madonna (cf. Anickov, "Zamyetki po rukopisyam i tvorchestvy Lermontova," *Slavia*, iv, 550 ff.). Yet his demonic spirit could not blind him to a certain responsibility for his misfortune. Perhaps some remark at the interview in Moscow after her marriage proved the inspiration for the work.

At all events in the *Two Brothers* Vyera is punished more severely than she is in the later versions. She is treated less charitably but at the same time, Yury is confronted with a rival, not the husband

but his own demonic brother. Up to this moment Lermontov, who was fully aware of the complications of his own character, had never tried to describe them. He had pictured each side of his feelings again and again. He had given tales of love and jealousy. He had represented Yury as the helpless victim of fate. Now for the first time he represented the willing tool in Alexander.

A few months later in another mood Yury was changed into Pechorin and Lermontov set himself to work out the problem on a broader scale, but he was not yet ready. Pechorin is still relatively simple, but there are germs of increasing complexity in his character. It was not until the *Hero of Our Time* that the author was ready to draw a full length picture of a hero who was at one and the same time sincere and artful, honorable and unscrupulous, a combination of opposing qualities which veiled from himself and his associates the underlying sincerity of his nature, a character who was both Yury and Alexander.

If this be the true interpretation of the *Two Brothers*, the play becomes not only a new example of the traditional literary model found so often in Schiller and elsewhere, but a recognition of the author's own spiritual problem and we are in a position to see in the two brothers and their love for one woman who has been aroused by each of them something of the doublets which were later to be developed by Dostoyevsky. Whatever its dramatic quality, it becomes more important as a source for the study of Lermontov's greatest character, Pechorin, and it explains the reason why that complex figure could retain the capacity for loving Vyera at a time when Pechorin's associates and Lermontov's critics found themselves hard pressed to give a reasonable answer.

CLARENCE A. MANNING

Columbia University

TASSO'S ANNOTATIONS TO TRISSINO'S POETICS

In his *Notizie dei libri postillati da Torquato Tasso*,¹ Solerti lists:

¹ Angelo Solerti, *Vita di Torquato Tasso*, vol. III, Turin, Loescher, 1895. App. III, pp. 113, 120. See also the same author's "Notizie dei libri postillati da Torquato Tasso che si conservano nella Barberiniana di Roma," *Rivista delle biblioteche e degli archivi*, VI, 1895, 115.

Trissino, *La Poetica e Il Castellano*, Vicenza, T. Ianiculo, 1529, in-fol. Esemplare tutto postillato dal Tasso presso il cardinale Valenti Gonzaga ai tempi del Serassi. Oggi non si sa dove si ritrovi. Le miscellanee del card. Valenti, da vero preziosissime, ora si conservano nella R. Bibl. Vittorio Emanuele, di Roma, ma purtroppo una mano rapace ne tolse via le più belle gemme, tra cui le prime edizioni del Trissino; chi sa che fra queste non si conservassero gli opuscoli postillati da Tasso?

It is easy to see why this volume should be of especial interest. Trissino's treatise deals with the same problems as does Tasso's dialogue *La Cavaletta, o vero de la poesia toscana*, and it frequently analyzes the same examples. Trissino was an authority often cited against Tasso during the Crusca polemic, and in Tasso's own essays on epic form Trissino's work is frequently reviewed. The *Discorsi del poema eroico* and their antecedent *Discorsi dell'arte poetica e in particolare sopra il poema eroico* contain a host of references to Trissino's works.² Tasso's letters from Sant'Anna and in the years after his release contain comments on *l'Italia liberata*,³ and he carefully annotated the *Sofonisba*.⁴ In the spring of 1585, while reading Horace's *Ars Poetica*, he made nineteen marginal notes; three of them refer to Trissino.⁵ A Tassist like Solerti would naturally be eager to examine the comments jotted down by Tasso in the very course of reading Trissino and might well lament their loss.

It is believed that the work containing them is now in a private collection deposited in the Houghton Library of Harvard University. The Houghton volume corresponds to Solerti's description. It is in-fol. in an old Italian rebinding and contains *La Poetica di M. Giovan Giorgio Trissino* (which consists of sixty-eight folios numbered only on the recto and bears both the mark of Ptolomeo Ianiculo da Brescia and the legend *Stampata in Vicenza per Tolomeo Ianiculo, Nel MDXXIX. Di Aprile*) and the *Dialogo del Trissino intitolato il Castellano, nel quale si tratta de la lingua italiana* (which consists of twenty unnumbered folios and carries

² For example, *Discorsi di Torquato Tasso*, vol. II, Pisa, Capurro, 1823, pp. 15, 57, 59, 62, 75, 86, 88, 191, 208, 209, 217, 229, 230, 235.

³ *Le lettere di Torquato Tasso a cura di Cesare Guasti*, Naples, 1857, Nos. 82, 211, 252, 434, 446.

⁴ Franco Paglierani, *La "Sofonisba" di Giangiorgio Trissino con note di Torquato Tasso*, Bologna, Romagnoli, 1884.

⁵ Rudolph Altrocchi, "Tasso's Holograph Annotations to Horace's *Ars Poetica*," XLIII *PMLA*, Dec. 1928, 931.

the same printer's mark as the *Poetica* but is undated). Both are heavily annotated, usually in the outer margin, but occasionally on the inner; and underscorings are frequent.

There is internal evidence that the annotations are by Tasso. At 49v., l. 11, is written: "Oltre tutte queste ballate ve n'è una di Guido Cavalcanti Ne le rime antiche ad imitazne de la quale io feci la mia Io mi sedea tutto soletto un giorno. la quale è ristretta in queste regole." The *ballata* referred to as *la mia* is one of Tasso's rhymes for Laura Peperara.⁶

At 26v., l. 21, opposite the quotation

Poscia, ch'amor del tutto m'ha lasciato;
Non per mio grato,
Che stato non havea tanto gioioso;
Ma però, che pietoso
Fa tanto del mio cuore,
Che non sofferse d'ascoltar suo pianto,

occurs the postil: "Considera se nel mio dialogo sia alcun errore in persona del N cioè che questi due senari facciano i piedi de la canzona, non la fronte com'egli dice. . . ." In Tasso's dialogue *La Cavaletta* these same lines are quoted by Forestiere Napolitano⁷ who then says: "Piacevi che questi sei primi sien fronte, o piedi? . . . Dunque volete che sia fronte? siasi: ma quelli che seguono sono tredici, nè possono esser sirima. . . ."

The apparent authorship of the annotations is confirmed by the handwriting, which has been carefully compared with published specimens⁸ and which seems certainly to be Tasso's script.

The annotations in general show the rarity of personal comment characteristic of Tasso marginalia.⁹ Of the postils, 401 in the *Poetica* and 69 in the *Castellano* merely repeat or summarize a passage from the text. They are not spread evenly through the volume but are grouped most heavily in the sections dealing with

⁶ *Le rime di Torquato Tasso, a cura di Angelo Solerti*, vol. II, Bologna, Romagnoli, 1898, p. 229. The resemblance to Cavalcanti's poem is there noted, and the date of composition placed in 1563-4.

⁷ *I Dialoghi di Torquato Tasso, a cura di Cesare Guasti*, vol. III, Florence, Le Monnier, 1859, p. 106.

⁸ Guido Biagi e Angelo Solerti, *Manoscritti, Cimeli, e Ricordi di Torquato Tasso*, Rome, Danesi, 1897; Angelo Solerti, *Vita di Torquato Tasso*, ed. cit., vol. I; Franco Paglierani, *op. cit.*; Rudolph Altrocchi, *op. cit.*

⁹ Angelo Solerti, *Vita di Torquato Tasso*, ed. cit., vol. III, p. 113.

metrics, stanza form, and rhyme, with another, lesser concentration around the treatment of words permissible in poetry.

Frequently Tasso seizes on particular words of an example cited by Trissino. Thus when the latter says (11r., l. 24),¹⁰ "La mutazione poi è quando una lettera si volta in un'altra com'è fuoco, fuoco, lume, lome, despetto, dispetto"; Tasso writes in the margin, "lume, lome, despetto, dispetto." Such focus on a single word is particularly striking when it occurs in bits of poetry quoted by Trissino to illustrate points wholly unconnected with problems of vocabulary. Thus, opposite Trissino's quotation (26r., l. 3)

Non vivo in disperanza,
Anchor, che me disfidi
La vostra disdegnanza,
etc.

Tasso has written "disdegnanza." And opposite a stanza (37v., l. 21) containing the line

Non solo per veder meraviljando

he has jotted "meravigdo."

In one instance, by a tiny change he turns Trissino's wording into a phrase which evokes a quality peculiarly his own. Trissino remarks (*Castellano*, 4v., l. 19) that Dante though in exile, remained faithful to the Tuscan idiom "e che secondo la quiete de la sua sensualità, non era in terra loco più ameno di Fiorenza." Tasso generalizes the thought, putting in the margin "quiete de la sensualità." In this phrase there is something unmistakably Tassian, a gleam of the golden light that lies across his poetry.

The attentiveness of his reading is shown by the cross references,¹¹ by the comparison of thoughts expressed in one section with those found in another, and by substitution of exact for general statement.¹² Occasionally he appears to miss Trissino's point, but in general his thorough knowledge of poetics enables him to indicate refinements of, or exceptions to rules propounded by Trissino.¹³

¹⁰ References are to the *Poetica* unless specifically marked *Castellano*.

¹¹ He employed a system of asterisks, daggers, and Roman numerals to facilitate these cross references.

¹² For example, when Trissino says (27r., l. 15) that there are many ("molti") kinds of *quinari*, Tasso, recalling the number given in the preceding section of the treatise, supplies the figure "cinquantadue."

¹³ There are at least thirteen instances of this. A typical example is

To the general rule of impersonal comment there are exceptions of a certain piquancy. Thus at the close of the *Castellano* (19v., l. 24) he cries out, "Che fà in questo dialogo il Sannazaro! o che dice!"

In the *Poetica* postils there are occasional direct judgments of poetry. Of the following four lines, Tasso finds the first pair "bellissimo" and the second pair "brutissimo":

Perche si miskia il crespo giallo, e'l verde;
Si bel, ch'Amor vi viene a stare a l'ombra;
Che m'ha serrato tra piccioli colli
Piu forte assai, che la calcina pietra.¹⁴

Of Dante's lines beginning "Ch'avrà in te si benigno riguardo," (7r., l. 15) he says, "I versi non sono splendissimi; quegli piuttosto: La gloria di colui, che tutto muove." He points out irregularities in Bembo's metrics;¹⁵ and in view of his own struggle with the depiction of amorous pleasure, the comment on *piaceri amorosi* is interesting.¹⁶

The disregard of capitalization and punctuation, the obliterations, and the general style of the hand, all indicate notes made quickly

found at the bottom of 44r. Trissino writes, "La volta sarà simile à la ripresa ne la quantità, e qualità de i versi . . ." To which Tasso adds, "La volta non è sempre simile a la ripresa ne la qualità, e ne la quantità ma discorde come in quella del Petrarca Perche quel che mi trasse ad amar prima. Il quale esempio è seguito dal Bembo in due ballate. Se non fosse il pensier, ch'a la mia donna. et in quella. Signor questa pietà che ti costringe."

¹⁴ 58v., ll. 12 ff.

¹⁵ 49v., l. 11: ". . . ma considera se ne l'altre degli antichi sia parimente osservata. perche Monsor Bembo esce di questa regola in due ballate l'una la mia leggiadra e candida angeletta perche la volta è diversa ne la quantità e ne la qualità de' versi da la ripresa et oltre a ciò le mutati non sono eguali et non hanno alcuno ordine. L'altra è ne gli Asolini si Rubbella d'amor ne si fugace se pur non vogliamo chiamar la canzone. Ma canzone irregolare è quella. A quai sembianze Amor mia donna aguglia."

¹⁶ Opposite the passage (9r., l. 6): "Sono anchora altri sensi dolci, i quali alcuna volta avanzano di dolceza i sopradetti, e questi sono il narrare quelle dilettaçioni, che a l'uso dei sentimenti nostri soavi e dolci si rappresentano . . . de le quali dilettaçioni, alcune sono inhoneste e lascivi, et altre nò," Tasso has written: "i piaceri amorosi ne la dolcezza." And a little below, at l. 32, he echoes the precept of the text, putting in the margin, "i sensi dolci voglion le parole de la purità e le pettinate."

and nervously. This impression is especially strong in telescopings¹⁷ and repetitions.¹⁸

The annotations of the *Poetica* probably date from the late summer of 1587. In that year, and probably in September, Tasso at Mantua writes to Giovan Battista Licino at Bergamo acknowledging a letter "di tre di settembre" and saying, "... e fate ch'io possa rivedere i dialoghi. Penso di far la giunta a quel de la Poesia toscana, perchè ho vista la Poetica del Trissino; la qual prima non aveva vista: ma mi manca la quinta o la sesta parte, la qual peravventura si dee trovare."¹⁹ No evidence of the date of the *Castellano* annotations has been found. The handwriting indicates the same general period as that of the *Poetica* postils.

Apart from their bearing on the place of Trissino in the history of Tasso's thought, these annotations are of interest because they reveal the occasion of some of the changes made in the dialogue on Tuscan poetry. But they are more important as a demonstration of Tasso's intense preoccupation with the minutiae of poetic technique; and they reveal, as his essays have no occasion to do, his detailed knowledge of theoretical prosody.

EDWARD WILLIAMSON

Harvard University

AN UNPUBLISHED TASSO SONNET

In a private collection deposited in the Houghton Library of Harvard University is a copy of the *Prose di M. Pietro Bembo nelle quali si ragiona della volgar lingua*, printed in Venice in 1525 by Giovan Tacuino. Its title page and margins are heavily annotated, and below the colophon is written a sonnet. These additions are in a hand which appears to be that of Torquato Tasso.

The volume once belonged to Rosini, the editor of the 33 volume *Opere di Torquato Tasso*, but its prior provenience cannot be traced, so that the authenticity of the postils must be established by comparison of handwriting and content with samples accepted as

¹⁷ For example, 29r., l. 9, where he has started to write *cord* for *concordi*.

¹⁸ 56v., bottom of page: "Tre modi con quali si congiunge la base a la fronte con l'istesse rime con diverse e con parte de l'istesse e parte de l'istesse." The last word obviously should be *diverse*.

¹⁹ *Le lettere di Torquato Tasso a cura di Cesare Guasti*, Naples, 1857, No. 888. The volume under consideration does lack parts five and six.

genuine. The script has been compared with numerous published reproductions of Tasso holographs.¹ Frequently the same word occurs in established specimens and in the material under consideration, and such coincidences afford the most dependable material for comparison by superimposing photostatic enlargements of the two samples. The peculiarities which characterize Tasso's script are present, for example, the back stroke of small case *d* in the round hand and the elevation, in the cursive hand, of the cross stroke of capital *N* so that it resembles *H*. The general character of the hand and the direction and habit of pen stroke accord with established specimens; and the quality and color of ink are what would be expected. A notable feature of the entries is that they appear to represent readings at different times and so exemplify the development of Tasso's hand, the variants of which are well marked in the collection of Biagi and Solerti.

The glosses through the body of the text show the rarity of personal comment which is characteristic of Tasso marginalia,² and this conformity of tone to previously published annotations³ reinforces the testimony of the handwriting in favor of authenticity. The majority of the postils are concerned with purely linguistic questions and either repeat or summarize Bembo's remarks, although occasionally an error in the text is pointed out. The close

¹ Guido Biagi e Angelo Solerti, *Manoscritti, Cimeli, e Ricordi di Torquato Tasso*, Rome, Danese, 1897; Angelo Solerti, *Vita di Torquato Tasso*, vol. I, Turin, Loescher, 1895; Franco Paglierani, *La "Sofonisba" di Giangiorgio Trissino con note di Torquato Tasso*, Bologna, Romagnoli-dall'Acqua, 1884; Rudolph Altrocchi, "Tasso's Holograph Annotations to Horace's *Ars Poetica*," XLIII, *PMLA*, Dec. 1928, 931. A point of comparison is afforded by the forgeries published by Romualdo Gentilucca, *Manoscritti inediti di Torquato Tasso*, Lucca, Giusti, 1837.

² "... per il modo da lui tenuto nel postillare, assai raramente le sue note svelano un pensiero o un sentimento, o dànno un giudizio. Nel maggior numero dei casi Torquato non faceva che ripetere in iscritto sui margini una parola o una frase, o in breve riassumeva l'argomento di un passo allo scopo di ritrovare facilmente quel luogo." Angelo Solerti, *Vita di Torquato Tasso*, ed. cit., vol. III, p. 113.

³ Paglierani, *op. cit.*; Altrocchi, *op. cit.*; Pier Desiderio Pasolini, *Il Trattato dell'Amore Humano di Flaminio Nobili con le postille autografe di Torquato Tasso*, Rome, Loescher, 1895; Enrico Celani, *Le Postille di Torquato Tasso alla Divina Commedia*, Città de Castello, Lapi, 1896.

attention with which Tasso read the treatise is indicated by the fact that its 93 folios⁴ carry some 1200 annotations.⁵

For Tasso students the true interest of the volume lies in the matter written on the verso of the title page and on the colophon page. The latter is a sonnet, which, while not absolutely first class, is considerably above the level of much cinquecento amatory verse. The style is tassian, and certain phrases show affinity with portions of known Tasso lyrics.⁶ It reads:

Gia la speranza, & l'aspettar m'annoia
E'l lungo stratio in che mia vita mena
Il fier ardor, ch'ogni dolcezza in pena
Mi volge, e vuol ch'inzan tempo moia.

Men che dieci anni faticorno in Troia
I Greci: e ogn'altra cosa il tempo affrena
Ma lasso il quinto lustro il sol rimena
Da ch'io sol vissi in angosciosa noia.

Ne potei mai sgombrar dal petto mio
Quella beltà ch'ogn'hor mi fu presente,
Ne quel perpetuo, et immortal desio.

Sarian le fiamme di Volcano spente
Co'l trapassar de sì gran tempo, et io
Non potei mai scemar la fiamma ardente.

The sentiment of the poem and something not unlike its allusion to inextinguishable flame occur also in the note on the back of the title page, which reads:

Dal di ch'io mirai la stupenda bellezza e le gratie di voi sola patrona della vita mia divenni all'improvviso una massa de vivo et inestinguil (sic) fuoco. piu volte pensando di smorzarlo son ricorso all'assentia ma allora gli occhi miei privati dellor vivo sole continuatamente versavano come viva fontana caldissime lagrime onde appresso nella presentia contemplando la maraviglia non mai piu veduta con la affabile dolcezza sorgeno (sic) gli sfrenati et ardentissimi desiderij latrocissima gelosia l'incertezza desserf. (sic) grato fanno intorno al mio core acerbissima guerra onde assaissime volte vicinissimo alla morte mi (illegible).

The temptation is very great to consider the note connected with the sonnet, and to regard them both as autobiographical. The fact

⁴ Numbered only on the recto.

⁵ No way has been found to date the postils. Tasso's letters yield no clue to the time of his reading of the *Prose*.

⁶ A. Solerti, *Le Rime di Torquato Tasso*, vol. II, Bologna, 1898; Nos. 61, 63, 66; No. 89, l. 10.

is that we have no evidence of a connection, and they are written in different styles of hand, though both attributable to Tasso. Even if the note relates to the sonnet, it may be a sketch for this or a similar poem, or may be simple exegesis. Both note and sonnet would thus remain literary exercises without biographical significance. It does, however, seem safe to add them to the body of Tasso's work.

EDWARD WILLIAMSON

Harvard University

FRENCH WOMEN MEMBERS OF THE RICOVRATI OF PADUA

Scattered through the two volumes of his *Nouvelle Pandore*, published in Paris in 1698, Guyonnet de Vertron gives much information on the Academy of the Ricovrati in Padua at the end of the XVIIth century and settles finally the question raised by Emile Magne and Bruce Morrisette in their works on Mme de Villedieu¹ as to whether this French novelist was actually associated with the Italian society. She is in fact listed, in unnumbered pages at the end of the second volume, as one of the deceased members. Also in an undated letter of Mme de Saliez to "Messieurs de l'Académie des Ricovrati à Padouë," reproduced in volume II, pp. 143-7, thanking them for her letters patent, one finds a reference to four other French women members: Mlle de Scudéry, Mesdames Deshoulières, Dacier and "de Ville-Dieu," "qui sont si dignes du rang que vous leur avés donné parmi vous." (p. 144)

At the end of the second volume (pp. 423-32), Vertron listed, besides himself, in the order of their reception, the French members of the Ricovrati:

1. Mlle de Scudéry, l'Universelle.
2. Mme Le Fèvre Dassier (Dacier), la Savante, noted for her erudition and her ardent defence of the ancients.
3. Mme de Salies (or Saliez) Viguière d'Alby, la Spirituelle, a provincial poetess.

¹ Emile Magne, *Madame de Villedieu (Hortense des Jardins)*, 1632-1692, Paris, 1907; Bruce Archer Morrisette, *The Life and Works of Marie-Catherine Desjardins (Mme de Villedieu) 1632-1683*, Saint Louis, 1947. See also by the author of this article, *Madame de Villedieu and the Academy of the Ricovrati*, *MLN.*, LXII (1947), 418-20.

4. la Présidente de Bretonvilliers, l'Admirable, author of unpublished *Contes, poésies sérieuses et galantes, devises*, and a *Comédie en proverbes*: "il n'y a rien de plus agreable" (*Catalogue des Dames illustres mortes* in unnumbered pages at end of t. II).

5. Mme Le Camus de Melson (Charlotte), l'Agréable, wife of a *conseiller d'état*. Her poetry appeared in *recueils* and journals, some in the *Histoire littéraire des femmes françaises*, Paris, 1769, 2e partie, p. 122.²

6. Mlle de La Force, l'Engageante, novelist and author of fairy tales.

7. Mme la comtesse de Barneville Daulnoy (d'Aulnoy), l'Eloquente, well known for her fairy tales and novels.

8. Mlle Deshoulières, la Sage victorieuse, poetess in her own right, as well as her mother.

9. Mlle Bernard (Catherine) de Rouen, l'Invincible, novelist and dramatist, whose play *Brutus* was more successful when it first appeared than was Voltaire's *Brutus*.

10. Mlle Chéron (Elisabeth-Sophie), l'Excellente, who gained some distinction by her poetry and also by her engravings (cf. her portrait of Mme Deshoulières); was a member of the Académie de peinture as well as of the Ricovrati, and received a pension from Louis XIV.

The following French woman and her two daughters are listed as Italian because of their residence in Padua—

1. Mme Hommezt Patin, la Modeste, author of *Réflexions morales et chrétiennes*, published in 1680.

2. Mlle Gabrielle (Charlotte) Patin, la Diserte; published in Latin a work on antiquities, which was admired by Bayle. It is probably to this writing that she referred in a letter to Vertron (I, 398), "le grand ouvrage sur lequel elle travaille," which she promised to send to him "des qu'il sera imprimé." Bayle supposed her to be the daughter of Guy Patin; she was in fact his granddaughter.

3. Mlle Charlotte (Catherine) Patin, Rose, author of several works in Latin, one of which, an explanation of forty-one paintings found in Padua, was published in 1691, in folio.

Finally Vertron lists six French women and one Italian woman as deceased members of the Ricovrati—

1. Mme Catherine de Vivonne, marquise de Rambouillet, la Lumière de Rome.

2. Mme Henriette de Colligny, comtesse de La Suze, l'Immortelle, equally

² See for example her scrimmage in verse (which took place while she was still Mlle Melson) with Voiture's nephew, the libertine Pinchesne, over the relative merits of Charles Perrault's and Chapelain's odes on *la Paix* and *le Mariage du roi*, reproduced by Frédéric Lachèvre in his *Bibliographie des recueils collectifs des poésies publiés de 1597 à 1700*, Paris, 1903, III, 394-7. These poems are taken from the ms. *Recueil de rondeaux pour l'agréable maison de Viry*.

celebrated for her beauty, amorous adventures and her poetry scattered through collections of the time.

3. Mme de Chate, auparavant Mme de Villedieu, l'Inépuisable.

4. Mme Anne de La Vigne, la Charmante, whose rather facile poetry was greatly lacking in verve. Cf. her *Ode à Mlle de Scudéry* published by Pellisson in his *Histoire de l'Académie française*, edition of 1672.

5. Mme Antoinette du Ligier de La Garde Deshoulières, la Parfaite.

6. Mlle Louise Anastasie de Serment, la Philosophe. A native of Grenoble, she went early to Paris, where she became a friend of Corneille and Quinault; Vertron filled many pages of his *Nouvelle Pandore* with her poetry.

7. la Signora Elena Piscopia Cornado, l'Humble, a *savante*, replaced at her death by Mme de Bretonvilliers. The Ricovrati held an extraordinary session to celebrate her memory in their usual place of meeting, the "Salle des géants," also used as the Public Library of Padua. (Cf. a letter to Vertron by Charlotte Patin, t. I, p. 398).

We know, furthermore, that Saint-Aignan of the French Academy and Mlle Lhéritier, author of *l'Adroite princesse*, had membership in the Ricovrati.

One wonders why at least twenty French women of letters, against possibly only one Italian woman, and two Frenchmen were invited to membership in the Paduan academy at the end of the XVIIth century. If this honor was conferred on such noted persons as Mme Deshoulières, Mlle de Scudéry and Mme de Villedieu, others, such as Mlle de Serment and Mme de Bretonvilliers, were scarcely likely long to remain "immortelles." The reason for the unusually great popularity of French women in this Italian academy may be surmised from the fact that three belonged to the same family residing in Padua, and is actually confirmed by Vertron, who informs us that Charles Patin, the husband of Mme Hommezt Patin, recommended no less than seven persons, including his friend Vertron, in the list of eleven living French members, not counting the three of his own family. Thus he was directly responsible for the invitation to the majority of the French associates of the Ricovrati. For many years he was its president, and, as such, appears to have imposed upon the academy his desires, as Richelieu had done in the case of the young French Academy. A noted doctor in Paris and the favorite son of Guy Patin, he had been exiled from France, probably because of some disagreement with Colbert, and after sojourns in Germany and Switzerland, had settled in Padua, where he became first a professor of medicine, then chief surgeon at the University, a very lucrative and honorable post. Noted also as a numismatologist,

he published in French and in Latin numerous works on medallions in Paris, Germany and Padua, was made a knight of Saint Mark by the senate of Venice, and a member of the *Académie des curieux de la nature* at Padua as well as of the Ricovrati. As the feminine members of his family were very learned, he was apparently as ardent an advocate of women as was his friend Guyonnet de Vertron.³ Living in forced exile in Italy, he was pleased to create a liaison between that country and France. We know that the influence of the erudite libertine Guy Patin extended in the first half of the century to Italian groups of free-thinkers, and now we see his son at the end of the century strengthening the relations between French and Italian literati.

MARY ELIZABETH STORER

Beloit College

RICHARD ALDINGTON'S PROPOSED "SOURCE" FOR *LA PRINCESSE DE CLÈVES*

In his introduction to a recent anthology of *Great French Romances*, including the Griffith 1777 translation of *La Princesse de Clèves*, Richard Aldington makes the startling claim to have discovered the long-sought-for and much-debated "source" of Mme de La Fayette's novel, and to have discovered it, not in some obscure story by a forgotten author, but in a place as obvious as the traditional cache of the purloined letter, namely, in Brantôme himself, long recognized as the source of Mme de La Fayette's background material. Aldington writes:

More relevant [than the prior publication of Mlle Desjardins' *Desordres de l'amour*] is a small literary fact, which appears (miraculously) to have escaped the attention of the many erudite commentators on *La Princesse de Clèves* . . . If you will look up the *Discours Septième* of the *Vie des Dames Galantes*, and read the paragraph beginning: "*Je vous fairay deux contes de deux femmes mariées* . . ." . . . you will find a story of a lady

³ Vertron eloquently defended the "mérite du beau sexe" before the Academy of Arles in a series of discourses which elicited heated controversy and served to fill a large part of the first volume of his *Nouvelle Pandore*. He was an ardent advocate and member of a new "Secte des Philosophes" established by Mme de Saliez d'Alby "en faveur des Dames." She declared that, thanks to Vertron, the equality of the two sexes "ne se conteste plus parmi les honêtes Gens" (t. 1, p. 126 ff.).

who makes an "*aveu*" to her husband. It is true that M. de Brantôme jests somewhat heartlessly at her "*sotte simplicité*" and that the story ends in a far less edifying manner; but still there is the "*aveu*," and what more was needed?¹

Perusal of the passage in question will, however, satisfy the judicious as to why Rudler and Chamard, as well as the editors of Brantôme, critics like Ashton, Beaunier, and Raynal, and the hundreds of cultivated readers who must have read not only his celebrated anecdotes but also *La Princesse de Clèves*, failed to establish the *rapprochement* which Aldington offers with such specious plausibility. Let us first state precisely what we mean by the *aveu*. We mean the confession by a wife to her husband of the fact that she loves another man. Aldington himself writes:

Driven pretty well out of the Maginot Line of her virtue, she [i. e., Mme de Clèves] as a last resort desperately tells her husband about her feelings, which naturally worries him a lot. (This is the "*aveu*.")²

Now for Brantôme's *conte*. It occurs in a series of anecdotes on the theme of incredible stupidity or naïveté in women, real or apparent, and it follows an obscene, though quite amusing, account of the cross-examination of a girl plaintiff in a case of rape. Brantôme writes:

Je vous fairay deux contes de deux femmes mariées, simples comme celle-là, ou bien rusées, ainsi qu'on voudra. Ce fut d'une bien très-grande dame que j'ay cogneu, laquelle estoit très-belle, et pour ce fort désirée. Ainsi qu'un jour un très-grand prince la requist d'amour, voire l'en sollicitoit fort, en luy promettant de très-belles et grandes conditions, tant de grandeurs que de richesses pour elle et pour son mary, tellement qu'elle, oyant telles douces tentations, y presta assez doucement l'oreille; toutes-fois du premier coup ne s'y voulut laisser aller, mais, comme simplette, nouvelle et jeune mariée, n'ayant encore bien veu son monde, vint découvrir le tout à son mary et luy demander avis si elle le fairoit. Le mary lui respondit soudain: "Nenny, ma mie. Jésus! que pensez-vous faire, et de quoy me parlez-vous? d'un infâme traict à jamais irréparable pour vous

¹ *Great French Romances*, Pilot Press, Duell, Sloan and Pearce, New York, 1946, p. xx. A recapitulation of the tremendously complicated problem of the sources of *La Princesse de Clèves* will be found in my *Life and Works of Marie-Catherine Desjardines (Mme de Villedieu), 1632-1683*, Washington University Studies, 1947, pp. 107-112.

² Aldington, *op. cit.*, p. xix. We shall not discuss here what the author may mean by "driven pretty well out of the Maginot Line of her virtue," or whether any reasonable interpretation of the phrase fits the facts of the story.

et pour moy.—Ha! mais, monsieur, répliqua la dame, vous serez aussi grand, et moi si grande, qu'il n'y aura rien à redire." Pour fin, le mary ne voulut dire ouy, mais la dame, qui commença à prendre cœur par après et se faire habille, ne voulut perdre ce party, et le prist avec ce prince et avec d'autres encores, et renonçant à sa sottise simplicité.²

Now, it is perfectly plain that Brantôme's heroine does *not* confess to her husband that she loves another man. Instead, she asks his advice as to whether she should accept the amorous attentions of a prince who is willing to pay her handsomely, with benefits to her husband as well! Leaving aside all considerations as to the character of such heroines as Mme de Clèves or the Marquise de Termes (in *Les Désordres de l'amour*), who struggle virtuously to repress their fatal attraction to other men, and who confess to their husbands only when the latter press them for an explanation of their strained and distant conduct, the situations are still not parallel. Brantôme's "simplette, nouvelle et jeune mariée" commits the ridiculous *blunder* of informing her husband that she has been propositioned, topping it by asking further "*si elle le feroit*." She has no "love" or "passion" to be confessed; how, then, can there be an *aveu*?

Two things more: Aldington writes that Brantôme "jests somewhat heartlessly at her '*sottise simplicité*.'" By implication, Brantôme the realist is represented as scoffing at the kind of noble confession made by the heroines of Mme de La Fayette and Mlle Desjardins. But, in the situation of the simple-minded *jeune mariée* asking her husband whether she should not accept the amorous bribes of a prurient seducer, what is there towards which one could conceivably jest "heartlessly"? Is one supposed to protest that after all, the woman was prompted by a lofty and worthy motive? Was she? And again, Aldington inserts this sly disclaimer: "It is true . . . that the story ends in a far less edifying manner." By implication, it begins in an edifying manner, quite, as it were, in the manner of *La Princesse de Clèves*. But does it? Brantôme's heroine is a mercenary, immoral *putain*. At her début in high-level prostitution, she makes a false step, an Agnès-like error in consulting what Brantôme himself calls the wrong *conseil*, but once warned, twice wary, and she quickly sees the light.

In short, Aldington has not produced the "source" of *La*

² *Œuvres complètes de Brantôme*, edited by Mérimée, Paris, Plon, 1894, XII, 40-41.

Princesse de Clèves, which "miraculously" escaped the attention of scholars. No doubt many readers, making no direct recourse to Brantôme, will accept his word for it that he has, so skillfully has he employed the devices of omission and implication. But there is no confession of love; Brantôme's *descouvrir*, however it is twisted, cannot be identified with Mme de Clèves' famous *aveu*.

BRUCE A. MORRISSETTE

Washington University

DE L'ESPRIT DES LOIS, BOOKS XXVI-XXXI

The last six books of *Esprit des Lois* have consistently troubled the critics. This is already clear in the analysis of D'Alembert, where the contents of Books XXVII and XXVIII are treated last, XXVI and XXIX are considered together, and XXX, XXXI are ignored completely.¹ Sorel felt that the work really ended at Book XXVI:²

Les livres XXVII à XXXI, tout considérables qu'ils sont en eux-mêmes, ne forment qu'un supplément consacré à un essai sur les lois romaines touchant les successions et à une histoire inachevée des lois féodales en France. A vrai dire, l'ouvrage s'arrête au livre XXVI.

Lanson, wanting to make of Books XXVII-XXXI the "temporal" division of the work, which he saw as organized according to the three categories of "laws-in-themselves," "laws in relation to space," "laws in relation to time," did not know what to do with Book XXIX, which is unfortunately a-temporal in treatment.³ Later he adopted a grouping of the books somewhat more in accord with their real nature, placing XXVI and XXIX together as "Livres de théorie et de technique législatives."⁴

Part of the problem can be settled fairly easily, both by external and internal means. Books XXX and XXXI were composed late and were still being written while the work was on the press; indeed they were so late that Vernet complained that Montesquieu was

¹ Laboulaye's edition of Montesquieu, III, 79, 80.

² Albert Sorel, *Montesquieu*, 2nd ed., 1889, p. 76.

³ G. Lanson, *L'Influence de la philosophie cartésienne sur la littérature française*, RMM, 1896, p. 541 and footnote 2.

⁴ G. Lanson, *Montesquieu*, Paris, 1932, pp. 7, 8.

keeping the presses idle.⁵ But even apart from this fact, the subject-matter of Books xxx, xxxi is quite different from that of xxvii, xxviii. The latter two were written, as we shall see, as a demonstration by example that laws as well as nations have a history. For Montesquieu's purpose, Book xxviii might just as well have dealt with laws of the Jutes or the Bantus, had he known them. Books xxx and xxxi have a quite different purpose, as their titles plainly indicate. They both begin with the term "Théorie des Lois," used for the first time in the work, and indicating a constructive rather than an analytical purpose. The first of them deals with the relationship between Frankish law and the establishment of the Frankish monarchy in Gaul, the second with the history of Frankish law in relation to the history of the French monarchy. They are, in fact, intended to state in historical terms Montesquieu's theory as to the nature and history of the French nation and its constitution. They form a sort of appendix to the work as a whole and their inclusion should be judged on that basis.

There remains the problem of Books xxvi-xxix: should the work have ended after the first of these, or should Montesquieu have grouped them differently, placing the first and the last of them together, as Lanson's second analysis suggests?

A full answer to this question would have to deal with the appropriateness of the form of *Esprit des Lois* as a whole. All that I wish to demonstrate for the moment is, that Montesquieu's grouping of the four books was intentional, that he was carrying out a preconceived plan, and that, seen from this point of view, Sorel's statement in particular is nonsense.⁶

Montesquieu states his plan for the work in detail toward the end of Book i, chapter 3,⁷ establishing the categories under which he will discuss laws. He will examine them, he says, in relationship to the nature and principles of governments, to the physical nature of the country, the means of livelihood of the people, the amount of liberty the constitution will permit, local religious customs,

⁵ Letter of Montesquieu to Cerati, 28 March, 1748, distinguishes clearly between "un morceau que je veux y mettre, qui sera un livre de l'origine et des révolutions de nos lois civiles en France"—clearly Book xxviii—and "deux livres sur les lois féodales" which are not yet finished—clearly Books xxx, xxxi. Letters of Vernet to Montesquieu, June 5, 24, 29, 1748.

⁶ *Loc. cit.*, footnote 2.

⁷ Laboulaye ed., pp. 99, 100.

psychology of the people, their wealth, numbers, commerce, mores and manners. "Finally," he says, "laws have relationships one with another, with their origin, with the object of the legislator, with the category of things about which they are established."⁸

Book xxvi carries out the promises of the first and last clauses of the above sentence. It deals with the laws, "in the relationship they should have with the category of things which they regulate." In doing so, it has almost of necessity to deal with the relationship of laws one with another. Thus chapter 2 deals with the relationship of divine and human laws, chapters 3-6 of civil and natural law, chapter 19 of civil and domestic law, etc.

Books xxvii, xxviii deal with what he had called the "origin" of laws and by the word "revolutions," with which in both their titles the word "origin" is complemented, the original term and Montesquieu's historical intent are made clear. Book xxvii is a very simple demonstration: Montesquieu states what he thinks were the inheritance laws of primitive Rome, with the "reasons" for their original form and provisions.⁹ He explains the "first" major change in them — by the Voconian law — as being the attempt to complete their effort at equality of property by restraints on the wealth of women. He explains the changes made in the code by Augustus as being prompted by the necessity, after the civil wars, of encouraging population, and so forth. He clearly feels that he has shown that changes made in Rome's inheritance laws were made in response to changing conditions, that the laws, in other words, can be explained in terms of their origins and history. Book xxviii, necessarily at much greater length, is intended to show the original complexity of law and custom in France, due to the differences in custom as between the various invading Germanic tribes and the pre-existence of laws and customs among the invaded Gallo-Romans, and to demonstrate how many of these customs and laws were lost or changed through historic events. That it is intended

⁸ Enfin elles ont des rapports entre elles; elles en ont avec leur origine, avec l'objet du législateur, avec l'ordre des choses sur lesquelles elles sont établies.

⁹ He explains, for example, the fact that wills were "registered" before five Roman citizens as follows:

Il y a apparence que ces cinq citoyens représentoient les cinq classes du peuple, et qu'on ne comptoit pas la sixième, composée de gens qui n'avoient rien. (Laboulaye, v, 243).

as a demonstration by example of a general law and not as a complete history, is clear from the apology for its shortness contained in its final paragraph:

Il auroit fallu que je m'étendisse davantage à la fin de ce livre: et qu'entrant dans de plus grands détails, j'eusse suivi tous les changements insensibles qui, depuis l'ouverture des appels, ont formé le grand corps de notre jurisprudence française. Mais j'aurois mis un grand ouvrage dans un grand ouvrage. Je suis comme cet antiquaire qui partit de son pays, arriva en Egypte, jeta un coup d'œil sur les Pyramides, et s'en retourna.¹⁰

Book XXIX does not carry in its title a direct reference to the "object of the legislator," the category which, according to Montesquieu's stated plan, still needed to be discussed. It is instead, entitled, "Of the manner of composing laws," perhaps with the idea that it was also to serve as a sort of handbook for legislators and thus as a logical conclusion to the whole work. However, it does in fact do exactly what had been promised. The first two chapters state shortly the principle that the legislator should proceed in a spirit of moderation; the formalities of jurisprudence are necessary, for example, but should be kept within bounds sufficiently to prevent too great delays in justice, and no matter how desirable the purpose of the law, its penalties must not be excessive. Immediately following these two short introductory chapters, Montesquieu proceeds to discuss the laws from the point of view of the aims of the legislator: laws sometimes seem contrary to the purpose of the law-maker, when in fact they are not, but are to be explained by some particular and local situation (cap. 3): sometimes the legislator has correctly estimated the need for a reform, but has chosen the wrong method to attain his end (caps. 4, 5): a law effective in one social situation may be ineffective or destructive in another (caps. 6, 7); laws which appear the same may not have the same end in view (caps. 8, 9). This book, in other words, discusses the purposes of legislators and the way to make those purposes effective.

Let us recapitulate. Montesquieu stated his intention to conclude his work with a consideration of the laws in relation to the matters with which they deal, with a consideration of them as historical phenomena, with a consideration of them from the point of view of the purposes of the legislator. Books XXVI-XXIX of his work carry out that intention, and so complete *Esprit des Lois*. It is absurd to

¹⁰ Laboulaye, v, 378.

couple Books xxvi and xxix, when Montesquieu clearly states that they deal with quite different categories. It is absurd to couple Books xxvii and xxviii with xxx, xxxi, when the two former are intended as particular examples demonstrating the general rule that laws change with the changing history of their society, while the two latter are an incomplete history of the constitution of France. Critics have the right to criticise the plan of Montesquieu's work, but it is scarcely good criticism to attempt to impose one's own plan upon it.

ROGER B. OAKE

University of Chicago

THE HEGELIAN IDEA IN *HERNANI*

David d'Angers found much "German philosophy" in Hugo's early plays, as did Alexandre Weill on returning from Germany where he had studied Hegel. M. Souriau, recounting these impressions, limits the matter to the influence of Schlegel's esthetics as known to the French poet through Madame de Staël's *De l'Allemagne*; but he is considering only the *Préface de Cromwell*.¹ He refers however to W. Reymond's curious study, *Corneille, Shakespeare et Goethe* (Berlin, Lüderitz, 1864), which compares Hugo's poetics with the philosophy of Hegel without establishing any actual contact between them.

There is evidence in *Hernani* of the poet's having read Victor Cousin's *Cours de philosophie* (1828). The importance of Cousin is that he served as a channel of transmission to France of German idealist philosophy, notably the thought of Schelling and Hegel. Hugo's *Idée* in these well-known lines is the Hegelian Idea, the dynamic of the philosophy of history:

Qu'une idée, au besoin des temps, un jour éclore,
Elle grandit, va, court, se mêle à toute chose,
Se fait homme, saisit les cœurs, creuse un sillon;
Maint roi la foule aux pieds ou lui met un bâillon;
Mais qu'elle entre un matin à la diète, au conclave,
Et tous les rois soudain verront l'idée esclave,
Sur leurs têtes de rois que ses pieds courberont,
Surgir, le globe en main ou la tiare au front.²

¹ *La Préface de Cromwell*, ed. by Maurice Souriau (Paris, Société française d'imprimerie et de librairie, 1897), p. 23 ff.

² *Théâtre* (Ollendorff), i 612. The following texts are taken from the

Hugo's symbolic drama anticipates the Hegelian definition of art as "a spiritual idea represented in sensuous form,"

Only in the highest art are the Idea and the representation genuinely adequate to one another, in the sense that the outward shape given to the Idea is in itself essentially and actually the true shape, because the content of the Idea, which that shape expresses, is itself the true and real content. It is a corollary from this . . . that the Idea must be *defined* in and through itself as *concrete totality*, and thereby possess in itself the principle and standard of its particularization and determination in external appearance.³

A recent critic, examining the plays from the standpoint of Freudian psychology, gratuitously denies the presence of any conscious development, recognizing in the characters nothing more than the unconscious expression of an Oedipus complex.⁴ In reality, thought and expression denote in Hugo

eighth and tenth lectures of Cousin's course, given on 12 June and 26 June 1828 respectively: "Le monde des idées est caché dans le monde des faits. Les faits en eux-mêmes et par leur côté extérieur sont insignifiants; mais, fécondés par la raison, ils manifestent l'idée qu'ils enveloppent, deviennent raisonnables, intelligibles. . . . Sans doute on fait très bien de recueillir les faits comme ils se passent; mais ce sont là plutôt des matériaux pour l'histoire que l'histoire elle-même. L'histoire proprement dite, l'histoire par excellence . . . ne se trouve que dans le rapport des faits aux idées. Le premier devoir de l'historien philosophe est donc de demander aux faits ce qu'ils signifient, l'idée qu'ils expriment. . . . Rappeler tout fait, même le plus particulier, à sa loi générale . . . , examiner son rapport avec les autres faits élevés aussi à leur loi, et de rapports en rapports arriver jusqu'à saisir celui de la particularité la plus fugitive à l'idée la plus générale d'une époque, c'est là la règle éminente de l'histoire."—"Un grand homme . . . vient pour représenter une idée, telle idée et non pas telle autre, tant que cette idée a de la force et vaut la peine d'être représentée, pas avant, pas après: la conséquence est qu'un grand homme paraît quand il doit paraître, qu'il disparaît quand il n'a plus rien à faire, qu'il naît et qu'il meurt à propos. . . . Un grand homme n'est pas un individu . . . ; sa fortune est de représenter mieux qu'aucun autre homme de son temps les idées de ce temps, ses intérêts, ses besoins." *Cours de philosophie* (Paris, Pichon et Didier, 1828), pp. 12-13, pp. 15-19.

³ Preface to *Vorlesungen über die Ästhetik* (1835-38). *The Introduction to Hegel's Philosophy of Fine Art*, trans. by Bosanquet (London, Kegan Paul, 1905), p. 179.

⁴ Hermann Hugé in Grenchen, *Les Drame de V. Hugo expliqués par la psychanalyse* (Solothurn, 1930). Charles Baudouin, *Psychanalyse de Victor Hugo* (Geneva, 1943), considers the plays as the expression of a transcendental idealism.

un être

Intelligent, qui court droit au but qu'il rêva.

Analysis of the monologue from which our text is taken (*Hernani*, iv 2), with its sequel at the conclusion of the act (iv 5), reveals the dialectical pattern: *Thesis*, Power; *Antithesis*, Weakness; *Synthesis*, Mercy. The prelude is a philosophy of history. Symbolically, the French poet views the structure of the imperial "edifice" as a *pyramid*, whose apex is a synthesis of liberty (the elective principle) and of authority.

De là vient l'équilibre, et toujours l'ordre éclate.

The whole scene is orchestrated with the same counterpoint.⁵ In its rhetoric dialectical value attaches to two figures which occur with great frequency: antithesis and climax. The imagery realizes that union of the finite and the infinite in phenomenal representation of an absolute ideal which, according to Hegel, is the definition of art. The ternary rhythm of the Romantic Alexandrine too has an unconscious relation to the logical pattern of XIXth century idealist thought. It is the organic principle, complementary to the dynamic *enjambement* at work breaking down the traditional forms. The language is a creative synthesis of realism and poetry, and many are the passages in which the symphonic harmony of the verse "identifies" itself with the rhythm and with the expressive qualities of the words.⁶ The esthetic principle in Hugo is total. *Hernani* is a "Gesamtkunstwerk," breathing the whole spirit of the Romantic Age.

D. O. EVANS

The University of British Columbia

⁵ Lines 1461-92: Power; 1493-1510: Weakness—1510-22: Power; 1523-60: Weakness. How fundamentally romantic is this opposition is brought out by Jacques Barzun in *Romanticism and the Modern Ego* (Boston, Little, Brown, 1944), p. 70.

⁶ F. Brunot, "Les Romantiques et la langue poétique," in *Le Romantisme et les Lettres* (Editions Montaigne, 1929), Chapter I.

JULIEN BENDA AND HUGUES REBELL

It is a notable fact that Julien Benda, who is today one of France's foremost theorists of democracy, began his literary career as anything but a democrat. His first book, *Dialogues à Byzance* (1900), composed in large part of articles he had written on the Dreyfus Case for *La Revue blanche*, contains a strong current of Nietzschean contempt for the forms and principles of democracy, a contempt which is most evident in the 'dialogue' entitled *La Revanche du riche*. The theory he advances here is a watered-down version of the Superman idea, in which M. Benda divides all of humanity into two classes, constituted by hereditary and biological factors and fated to hostility in their struggle for social domination. These two classes are the 'aptes au bonheur' (defined here as the satisfaction of desires and needs) and the 'inaptes.' The former are the free, and happy, the strong, the healthy, the intelligent of the world; the 'inaptes' are the serfs, the weak, the unhappy, the stupid, the suffering—the great majority of mankind. To disarm and dominate their betters these serfs have invented humanitarianism and Christianity, the refuge of the disinherited, and are in a fair way to impose on the world their 'prejudice' that no man is responsible for his own miseries. They cannot know liberty, for its concept is beyond them; all they know is a degrading equality. They are jealous of wealth, never realizing that money alone makes the economic wheels turn; and they would level all fortunes should they be fortunate enough to win the old struggle for power. They hate life, are pessimists, Christians, while the 'aptes' are lovers of the cordial of existence, pagans, optimists. It is particularly since 1789 that the values and ideas of the 'inaptes' have triumphed in Europe; the 'flot souffreteux' is about to engulf the world.

If the rise of the 'suffering' to the final domination of society is to be prevented, then the representatives of human nobility in all its forms must band together in a coalition for patrician defense. The aristocracies of money, of birth and of intellect—the three great classes of the 'aptes'—must form a union if they would continue their existence in the stagnant atmosphere of democracy. This union would be a natural product of the essential nature of the man of wealth, the man of wit and the man of title, for all these representatives of human superiority share the authoritarian spirit

and all are born opponents of the monotonous sameness of the democratic régime. Certain practical obstacles, of course, present themselves to any such coalition and it is not probable that Europe will soon see the symbolic trio Duclaux-Reinach-Hervé de Kérouhant. But

. . . quels que soient les noms des mandataires et la date de la signature, il se conclura nécessairement, le traité d'alliance entre les trois expressions de la force: l'argent, la raison et l'esprit d'autorité. Ce jour-là, l'invasion chrétienne pourra considérer que ses progrès sont gravement compromis, et que le monde appartient de nouveau à l'idéal des aptes au bonheur. Ce jour-là, la Révolution—au lieu de nous apparaître comme une opération de chirurgie sociale douloureuse, stérile et décevante, substituant à un régime assurément inique un état de stagnation définitif et imperfectible—nous apparaîtra comme la plus bienfaisante des convulsions humaines, puisqu'elle aura déterminé la secousse féconde, celle qui, détruisant l'antique superposition des individus et les soumettant à une profonde pénétration réciproque, leur aura permis ensuite de se rétablir dans un nouvel ordre de densités sociales, sous une hégémonie, cette fois, positiviste.¹

This same idea of an alliance of the authoritarian forces of the world had been already expressed in 1894 by Hugues Rebell in a brochure entitled *L'Union des trois aristocraties*. Rebell was, until his death in 1905, one of the leading purveyors of Nietzschean doctrine in France and a fairly well known theorist of political reaction. He had been one of the first to present important portions of *Thus Spake Zarathustra* in translation (in *L'Hermitage* for 1893) and in 1894, the year of the appearance of *L'Union des trois aristocraties*, had attracted considerable attention with a poeticized version of certain Nietzschean theories in a collection entitled *Chants de la pluie et du soleil*. Had he lived a few years longer, he would undoubtedly have played an important role in the obstructionist movement led by Maurras and Léon Daudet.²

Rebell sees in democratic rule only stupid equality, in the fall of the old hierarchy only ruin for intellectualism and nobility of life. Egalitarianism has brought the rich man to apologize for his wealth,

¹ Julien Benda: *Dialogues à Byzance*, Paris (Editions de la Revue blanche), 1900, p. 92.

² For information on Rebell (by his true name, Georges Grassal) see Henri Mazel: "Hugues Rebell," *Mercure de France*, 54 (1905), pp. 481-502; Auriant: "La Jeunesse d'Hugues Rebell," *ibid.*, 217 (1930), pp. 277-308; and Remy de Gourmont: "Nouveaux Masques," *ibid.*, 24 (1897), pp. 67-88.

the titled gentleman to beg for inclusion in the vile plebe, the intellectual to prostitute himself to the masses for his daily bread. Christian humanitarianism only leads men to cry out against the strong, declaring that: "Nous ne voulons pas plus de supériorités intellectuelles que de supériorités sociales . . . vous, sots, malades, impuissants, vous êtes les égaux des forts, des sains, des intelligents, c'est l'arrêt de *notre* justice, la nouvelle et la meilleure."³ So, if they would survive, the nobility of birth and the nobility of money must unite against their common enemy, democracy. But their union will be weak and purposeless if they do not possess some ideal of social action; it will be the function of the intellectual to forge this ideal for them and he must at all costs be enticed into the alliance. His situation is precarious enough in democracy to make it probable that he will wish to join them, for he has lost his old exemption from the law of the struggle-for-life and now lives only by pandering to the popular taste. It will be the function of such men as Rebell to create this alliance, to attract the gentleman from his alcove and his stables, to teach the rich man to spend shamelessly and freely, to persuade the intellectual to write with honesty and high purpose. And when they have succeeded in their cause, these makers of the union of tomorrow, the world will rise again from its Christian stagnation and desuetude and will become once more the dwelling-place of intellect and nobility of soul:

Quand on aura compris qu'il n'est pas de plus funeste mensonge que celui de l'égalité des hommes, qu'il n'est pas de société plus misérable que celle où l'on ne reconnaît aucune hiérarchie, quand cette richesse, cette noblesse, cette science qui se dissimulent ou se cachent aujourd'hui prendront conscience de leur valeur et, au lieu de demander pour le compte des autres, se battront pour leur propre cause, je vous assure qu'un nouvel ordre de choses se dessinera. Pour nous . . . nous ne cacherons point nos sentiments . . . Jugeant que la nature choisit certains êtres pour le pouvoir, nous détestons les gouvernements fondés sur la souveraineté de la populace et n'avons qu'un désir, c'est celui d'effacer de nos mœurs et de nos institutions le souvenir de Quatre-vingt-neuf.⁴

The very evident similarity of the two essays does not of course necessarily indicate that M. Benda borrowed the idea of *La Revanche du riche* from Hugues Rebell. He may well have arrived

³ Hugues Rebell: *L'Union des trois aristocraties*, Paris (Bibliothèque Artistique et Littéraire), 1894, p. 26.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 48.

independently at the same political solution as the apostle of Nietzschean reaction had a few years earlier. But it is at least interesting to note that at the outset of his career France's great present-day defender of pure democracy was echoing the thoughts of one of the predecessors of *Action française*. Had he followed these ideas in his later writings, he would have been led, inevitably, into the paths of nationalism, militarism and Fascism. His evolution to his present position had been a long one; it is all to the credit of his sense of social justice.

ROBERT J. NIESS

Harvard University

THE "D. T." POEMS IN OVERBURY'S *A WIFE*

Among the various elegiac and commendatory poems prefixed to later editions of Sir Thomas Overbury's celebrated poem *A Wife nowe a Widowe* (1614) are three which bear the initials "D. T." There is no reason to doubt that all three are from the pen of the same man; and, as I hope to make apparent here, there is likewise little room to doubt that the writer was Daniel Tuvill. Indeed, as long ago as 1856 this identification was conjecturally advanced, but without supporting evidence, by Rimbault in his edition of Overbury's works.¹

Strong presumptive evidence of identity is to be seen in the fact that in five of the six works now known to have been written by Tuvill, his authorship is acknowledged, either on the title-page or in prefatory epistles, by the bare use of the initials "D. T." This, in turn, is negatively supported by the *STC* entries of only two other writers bearing these initials: Daniel Tilenus (*STC* 24067-24072) and Daniel Tossanus (*STC* 24144-24145), the nature of whose works almost automatically precludes the ascription of the Overbury poems to either of them. Moreover, the presence of the "D. T." poems among several other sets of poems bearing initials confidently ascribed to writers of some literary note—William

¹ *The Miscellaneous Works in Prose and Verse of Sir Thomas Overbury, Knt.*, ed. Edward F. Rimbault (Library of Old Authors: London, 1890). On the first appearance of these initials Rimbault notes, p. 279: "Probably the same person who wrote *Essaies Politicke and Morall*, Lond. 1608, 12mo. His name is unknown."

Browne, John Fletcher, John Ford, Richard Carew, etc.²—would seem to point to a man of established reputation and ability. As the author of four books printed between 1608 and 1616, Daniel Tuvill would seem qualified for a place in such company.

Another circumstance lends further support to the equating of "D. T." with Daniel Tuvill. Laurence Lisle (or L'Isle), publisher from the outset of *A Wife* and of other works associated with Overbury, was the publisher of the seventh edition³ of *A Wife*, the first edition in which the three "D. T." poems appear. It was he who published in that same year another encomium of good women: *Asylum Veneris: Or A Sanctuarie for Ladies*.⁴ The dedicatory epistle to this book, like the poems in the Overbury volume, is signed "D. T."; but the authorship is placed beyond doubt by the entry to Lisle in the Stationers' Register, 7 May, 1616,⁵ of "a booke called *A sanctuarie for Ladies* by. D. Tuvell."

The "woman question" was just at this time much agitated in the press, partly as a result of Overbury's poem itself and of the various imitations, answers, and continuations it provoked, and partly as a result of the fracas precipitated by the publication, in 1615, of Joseph Swetnam's *Araignment of lewd, idle, froward, and vnconstant women*. It is reasonable to assume, therefore, that Lisle, knowing both the identity of "D. T." and his interest in the controversy over women, invited him to contribute verses to the new impression of Overbury's poem. This explanation, at any rate, would account for the first appearance of the "D. T." poems in the seventh impression of *A Wife*.

That Tuvill was interested not only in Overbury's poem and untimely demise but also in the trial of Somerset and Lady Essex for complicity in his murder may reasonably be inferred from two facts: first, that the trial was in progress while the *Asylum Veneris*

² Rimbault, *op. cit.*, p. 280. W. J. Paylor, in his edition, *The Overburian Characters To which is added A Wife* (Oxford, 1936: Percy Reprints, XIII), neatly evades the problem of identification by omitting the prefatory poems.

³ *Sir Thomas Overburie His Wife, With New Elegies vpon his (now knowne) vntimely death . . . Editio Septima*. London, Printed by Edward Griffin for Laurence L'isle . . . 1616.

⁴ It should be noted that Lisle was also the publisher of Tuvill's *The Dove and the Serpent* (1614).

⁵ Arber's *Transcript*, III, 588.

was in press (May, 1616); and second, that the prosecution was opened by Sir Henry Montague,⁶ Tuvill's patron and the dedicatee of two of his books.⁷

So far as is known, Tuvill published no volume of poetry. But his reading of the poets appears from almost every page of his prose works, and his own dabbling with verse may be followed in his customary translating of the Classic fragments he quotes. These, if not remarkable as poetry, are generally adequate and easy—of a level, I should say, with the three performances in *A Wife*. Furthermore, though their scope is far too limited to authorise confident assertion, the three "D. T." poems in *A Wife* offer, to anyone intimately acquainted with Tuvill's usual turn of expression, certain highly characteristic locutions. Distinctively Tuvillian, for instance, is the substitution of the comparative for the simple adjective in "their *chaster* influence";⁸ and the contrast of inward-outward in "So faire without, so free from spot within" and in "the inward worth,/ The outward carriage"⁹ is almost a

⁶ See *DNB*, entries "Carr, Robert" and "Montagu, Sir Henry"; also Andrew Amos, *The Great Oyer of Poisoning* (London, 1856), pp. 122-24.

⁷ *The Dove and the Serpent* (1614) and *Christian Purposes and Resolutions* (1622).

⁸ Sig. 4. Extremely common in Tuvill's books; compare *Essaies Politicke, and Morall* (1608), "ruder ignorance," "vnriper youth" (sigs. A3^v, F2^v); *Essayes, Morall and Theologicall* (1609), "slower apprehension," "corrupter times" (sigs. B6, B11); *The Dove and the Serpent* (1614), "nobler bosome," "weaker pride" (sigs. A3, G3); *Asylum Veneris* (1616), "discreeter admiration," "diuiner complement" (sigs. C3^v, G)—and twenty-one other instances; *Christian Purposes and Resolutions* (1622), "profaner mindes," "younger Vnicornes" (sigs. M2, M6); *St. Pauls Threefold Cord* (1635), "darker bowels," "unriper age" (sigs. B9, L3^v).

⁹ Sigs. A3, A3^v. Of the many instances that could be adduced, compare with these the following: *EPM*, "inward disposition . . . outward imposture" (Q3^{r-v}), "conceiue of their inward disposition, by their outward conversation" (F8); *EMT*, "outward markes of Priesthood . . . impuritie . . . in their hearts" (B11), "countenance the outward action with some inward pittie" (D10); *D&S*, "compose thy inward minde, that thy outward carriage may continually be calme" (B2); *AV*, "This inward Beauty, graced with outward comelinesse" (A3^v), "least want of grace in their outward gesture, might make their inward goodnesse liable to misconstruction" (D3); *CPAR*, "It is not the beauty of outward obiectes that attractes his Eye" (G10), "If the in-side of the Vessel be not cleane, let the out-side bee as glorious as it will . . ." (K10); *SPTC*, "inward, and spirituall man . . . outward Man" (N8).

mania with him. Other Tuvillian usages may be seen in "murdering hand, [*w*]oaded in guiltlesse blood,"¹⁰ in "Couvre-feu Bell,"¹¹ and "Settled affections."¹²

Finally, a sonnet in the "Epilogue" to the *Asylum Veneris*¹³—judiciously, though silently, borrowed—reads almost as if Tuvill were deliberately annotating Overbury's poem:

Who doth desire, that chast his wife should be
First be he true, for truth doth truth deserue:
Then such he be, as she his worth may see,
And one man still credit with her deserue.
Not toying kinde, nor causelessly vnkinde;
Not stirring thoughts, nor yet denying right,
Not spying faults, nor in plaine errors blinde;
Neuer hard hand, nor euer raines too light.
As farre from want, as far from vaine expense;
The one doth force, the later doth intice;
Allow good companie, but keep from thence,
All filthie mouthes, that glorie in their vice.
This done, thou hast no more, but leaue the rest,
To Virtue, Fortune, Time, and Womens brest.

The doctrinaire "D. T." who bolstered his arguments with those lines was, at any rate, eminently qualified to contribute to the growing corpus of Overburiana.

JOHN LEON LIEVSAY

The Folger Shakespeare Library

¹⁰ Sig. 4; compare *Asylum Veneris*, sig. Cv, "an outward dye, not *w*oaded with any grace or abilities." My italics.

¹¹ Sig. 4v; compare *Asylum Veneris*, sig. L4, "But the Coudre-feu Bell hath alreadie rung."

¹² Sig. A3. I do not find this identical combination in Tuvill, yet it is exactly what might be expected. He seldom uses *affection* without a preceding adjectival modifier; and *settled* is of fairly common occurrence in his works. Compare the following phrasal combinations: *EPM*, "vnsettled iudgement" (P6v); *EMT*, "settled countenance" (I4); *D&S*, "settled trutthes" (D); *AV*, "settled Grauitie" (D3); *EPM*, "vehement affection," "charitable affection," "disordinate . . . affection" (D4, D5, G4); *EMT*, "irregular affections" (C2); *D&S*, "singular affection" (F3v); *CPAR*, "louing affection," "vnbrideled Affection" (D, E4); *SPTC*, "sinister affections," "froward Affection," "passionate Affection" (E3, F10v, P).

¹³ Sig. K. From Book III of Sir Philip Sidney's *Arcadia* (ed. 1598), sigs. Ii4v-Ii5; reprinted in *Englands Parnassus* (1600), ed. Charles Crawford (Oxford, 1913), pp. 27-28.

THE EMBLEME FOR DECEMBER IN THE
SHEPHEARDES CALENDER

To the text of each eclogue of *The Shepheardes Calender* is appended an "Embleme." Spenser uses the word *embleme* rather loosely, explaining what he means by equating it, in January, April, June, July, August, September, with *poesye*.¹ Some of the "emblemes" would be suitable for the *impresa* popular in the time, such as that for November, which was Marot's *impresa*, or Willyes for August: *Vinto non vitto*. Others, as for February and March, go beyond the few words permitted to an *impresa*.² The motto for December has always been lacking, though copies of the first edition show in the proper place the heading "Colins Embleme," with the space between it and the printer's ornament below that is normal when a motto of one line is used. The embleme for October is curious, with its *etc.*, and the Glosse implies that there should be one for Piers as well as for Cuddie. So two emblemcs out of twelve are imperfect. Hughes supplied an embleme for December:

Vivitur ingenio, caetera mortis erunt.

This fits the idea admirably, but there is no reason to suppose it the motto Spenser had in mind. Incidentally, it does not have the flavor of the other emblemcs, which usually involve a jingle of sound, if by no more than rime, or suggest the motto of an *impresa*; these qualities are least evident in those for April, but even they still have an allusive quality, reminding the reader of a scene instead of stating an idea directly; the embleme supplied by Hughes is a plain assertion.

At the very end of the Calender stands a motto that in its repetition of sound, its brevity, its cryptic quality, resembles but perhaps surpasses some of those attached to the eclogues. It seems isolated, even meaningless where it stands, having no obvious relation to anything. The verses that precede it, the envoy of the poem,

¹ For a *poesie* as the motto of an *impresa*, see Samuel Daniel, *Works* (Spenser Society), iv. 17, 22, 25; v. 298, 302.

² "The mot or posie of an *Impresa* may not exceedee three words" (Samuel Daniel, To the Friendly Reader, before *The Worthy Tract of Paulus Jovius, contayning a Discourse of rare inventions, both military and Amorous, called Imprese*, *Works* iv. 25).

corresponding to the verses *To His Booke* at the beginning, seem to form a suitable conclusion, rendering anything further superfluous. To this motto no editor has given any attention; the Variorum records no comment. It is printed in the same type as the emblems for the various months and would fit the space left between *Colins Embleme* and the printer's ornament at the end of December.³ But what of its meaning, allowing for the indirectness suited to an *impresa*? The glosse says of the missing embleme for December: "The meaning whereof is that all thinges perish and come to theyr last end." This is true of *merce*, which means *wares, goodes, merchandise*, referring to the perishing riches of the world. The glosse continues: "workes of learned wits and monuments of Poetry abide for ever." This is true of *mercede*, the *reward* of the poet, fame, which does not perish but is the monument of brass spoken of by Horace. *Merce* perishes, but not *mercede*. Something of this appears in lines in October, also on the poet:

Cuddie, the prayse is better than the price,
The glory eke much greater then the gayne (19-20).

Perhaps a printer directed to put *Merce non mercede* after the last eclogue put it instead after the last verses he saw, those of the envoy. At any rate, it seems likely that the words were intended as Colins embleme.

ALLAN H. GILBERT

Duke University

HABINGTON'S *CASTARA* AND THE DATE OF HIS MARRIAGE

Arber states that the marriage of William Habington and Lucy Herbert, daughter of the first Lord Powis, took place "between 1630 and 1633: later than which it cannot be: as the anniversary of his wedding day is celebrated in verse."¹ Probably following

³ Professor Charles G. Osgood, editor of the *Shepheardes Calender* in the Variorum Spenser, and Professor Don Cameron Allen have kindly examined rotographs of the Huntington copy. See also H. Oskar's Sommer's facsimile, London 1890.

¹ *Castara*, London, 1870, p. 4. The poem to which Arber refers is "Loves Aniversarie," *Castara*, London, 1634, p. 73.

the lead of Arber, A. H. Bullen gives the date of the marriage as "sometime between 1630 and 1633."²

There is evidence to show that this event, so important to the poet and to his book, occurred in the spring of 1633. In several poems which appear in the first edition of *Castara* (1634), Habington laments the absence of his mistress. In the first of these, he complains of her absence in the country.³ In the next, he mentions the town of Marlow, and "Seymours," the house in which she was living.⁴ In the next, he implies that he has been denied access to "Seymours."⁵ In another poem of the series,⁶ he mentions the spring; and in an address to the "house of Seymours" he mentions the spring again.⁷

Since the leases to "Seymours" were not assigned to Eleanor Herbert, Lucy's mother, until 1633,⁸ it is evident that Habington could not have been denied the premises before 1633 unless the Herberts took possession before the lease was signed, which is not likely; and we may suppose that the marriage had not taken place before the spring of 1633.

The first edition of *Castara* was entered in the *Stationers' Register* on March 21st, 1633/34,⁹ and the poem which marks the anniversary of the wedding appears in this edition; consequently, as Arber points out, the marriage must have taken place in 1633. The signs of spring which Habington mentions in the poems addressed to *Castara* at "Seymours" could not have appeared much before the end of February; therefore, we may assume that the wedding came late in February or in March of 1633, quite probably during the latter month.

HOMER C. COMBS

Washington University

² *D. N. B.*, VIII, p. 858.

³ *Castara*, London, 1634, p. 24.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 33.

⁸ *Victoria County History of Buckingham*, III (1925), p. 74.

⁹ *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London; 1554-1640*. Edited by Edward Arber. 5 vol., London, 1877, IV, p. 288.

COWLEY'S PINDAR

Cowley's study of the text and critical apparatus of Pindar has never been doubted; but thanks to his Latin paraphrases and the glosses on his translations of the Second Olympic and the First Nemeaeon, one is able to place one's finger on the exact edition that Cowley used. As Shafer pointed out many years ago,¹ there were numerous editions available to Cowley. Three of these editions had distinct Latin versions. The Stephanus translation of 1560 was the earliest and the 1616 translation of Schmidt as well as the 1620 metaphrastic version of Benedictus are based on it. The Benedictus text also contains a paraphrastic translation of great fullness; but it is the metaphrastic version, with the sort of variants that one finds whenever a man of the seventeenth century quotes Latin, that Cowley adopted. A few lines from the third stanza of the Second Olympic suggest the method that is followed in both of Cowley's Latin translations.

COWLEY

Actorum autem vel jure vel injuria infectum ne Tempus quidem omnium pater possit reddere operum finem. Sed Oblivio cum sorte prospera fiat. Bonis enim a gaudiis malum molestum domitum perit, quando divina sors mittit de caelo altas divitias.

BENEDICTUS (Metaphrasis)

Actorum autem iure vel iniuriae infectum ne tempus quidem omnium parens possit reddere operum finem. Sed oblivio sorte cum prospera esse possit. Bonis enim a gaudiis malum perit odiosum domitum. Quando divina sors miserit sursum opes altas.

STEPHANUS

Antea actorum autem operum finem & cum iure & praeter ius, infectum ne ipsum quidem tempus omnium parens possit reddere: sed oblivio, sorte cum prospera esse possit. Bonis enim a gaudiis malum perit odiosum domitum: quando Dei numen mittit tandem opes altas.

SCHMIDT

Factorum autem justaeque & praeter jus, infectum, ne quidem Tempus omnium parens possit efficere, operum finem. Oblivio autem eorum sorte cum felici feri potest. Bonis enim a gaudiis, malum perit odiosum superatum, quando Dei numen mittit minus beatitatem excelsam.

¹ *The English Ode to 1660* (Princeton, 1918), pp. 56-7; see also J. Loiseau, *Abraham Cowley* (Paris, 1931), p. 351.

The verbal similarities that exist between the Latin version of Cowley and that of Benedictus indicate that Cowley patterned his translation on the French metaphrase. The dependence of Cowley on Benedictus may be further indicated by comparing the scholia. Schmidt's scholia is sometimes taken over by Benedictus, but there are enough additions in the French text that are adopted by Cowley to suggest that when Schmidt and Benedictus have an annotation in common, the latter is Cowley's authority. The notes taken over from Benedictus edition for the Second Olympic are: 1. 1 (B. 36), 1. 2 (B. 38), 1. 3 (B. sig. C iv), 1. 4 (B. 39), 2. 1 (B. 41), 2. 2 (B. 42) (B. 37), 2. 3 (B. 42), 3. 1 (B. 44, trans. by Cowley), 5. 2-3 (B. 50), 5. 4 (B. 37), 5. 5 (B. 52), 7. 1 (B. 56), 7. 2 (B. 57), 7. 3 (B. 58), 9. 2 (B. 62). The other notes seem to have been supplied by Cowley from his own vast fund of classical learning though at times he follows the hints of Benedictus. The story of Ino and Semele at 3. 2 is added in this way and so is the full story of Oedipus at 4. 2. The references to Homer at 7. 1 and to Vergil at 7. 2 are given by Benedictus, but Cowley looked up the quotation.

I suppose it is not much to point out this relationship, but it may give someone a clearer idea of how Cowley worked and a more patient scholar than I might like to demonstrate at some length Cowley's method of translation and the sources of the annotations on his original odes.

DON CAMERON ALLEN

W. E. LEONARD'S ANNOTATIONS IN A COPY OF *POEMS 1916-1917*

The late Professor William Ellery Leonard's *Poems 1916-1917*, privately printed, bears no date of publication. A copy of this somewhat rare book was presented in 1925 to Charles Bulger, now Dean of the Graduate School of the University of Akron, by Leonard. His attitude toward Germany and the Allies is explained in the final sentence of the Preface (page 8): "Hence it is that 'justice to Germany,' rather than 'above the battle,' is the dominant note in these pages—justice to Germany, with hatred, however, to none of her foemen, except the arch-foemen, Ignorance, Slander, and Hypocrisy." Various notes in the author's handwriting are

of interest and are perhaps elsewhere unrecorded. These notes and annotations are as follows.

1. On the front inside cover:

Note. These jottings in rhyme, written during the war-fury in protest against the utterly uncritical and unjust attitude of America, partake to be sure of the belligerency of the times; yet, deducing [*sic*] a few casual martial notes of defiance against the martial notes around me, I'd say the general sound ~~was~~ is to me still acceptable, certainly far nearer the truth (as time is showing) than the states of mind to which it was a reaction. The volume has not circulated much—even privately—but may sometime be of interest as a contemporary record.

W E L

An arrow drawn to the fly leaf indicates an afterthought:

Many of the verses were published in newspapers and non-de-script magazines under the pseudon., "Oliver Ames."

2. Written on the fly leaf is the following inscription:

For Charles Bulger, on the occasion of his receiving his Doctor's degree, from his colleague—William Ellery Leonard.

Jan. 1925,
Madison, Wis.

3. On page 6 of the Preface Leonard says that under President Wilson our foreign policy has progressed toward neutrality and has opportunity now to assist, "*perhaps to lead, in the restoration of peace and the reconstruction of Europe.*" Leonard has underscored the words within the quotation marks. Written in the margin opposite is a note:

I missed my guess here!!—see accompanying off print of letter to N. Y. *Nation*.¹

4. At the foot of page 8 of the Preface, just below the printed date, "January, 1917," stands the penned note:

¹ The off print of which he speaks is a column length letter (cx, 109, Jan. 24, 1920) under the caption, "The Man With the Yellow Streak." Written on the off print are a few notes in Leonard's hand. In the letter the printed words, "*this plausible document*," are underscored by him, and in the margin opposite is written: "= League of Nations of course." Following the printed date at the end of the letter, "January 1," is written "1920"; and under this in turn is written "written July 1919." After the printed pseudonym, "Robert Wylie Weldon," Leonard has signed his initials, "= W E L." Below his pseudonym he has penned (by way of explaining it): "Wiley Well-Done!"

Written toward the end of 1916—and years before overwhelming evidence of the truth of these contentions was forthcoming. *Intelligence* did not need more evidence than was available from the start.

5. The poem "The Frankenstein" begins on page 25; under the title is a printed excerpt: "This Monster without a soul, this man-made Mockery, the Frankenstein of States, the Shame and Terror of Civilization—'Newspaper Editorial.'" On page 26 Leonard has written the following footnote:

Yet, if I had but reperused it myself, I would have noted that *Frankenstein* was the name, not of the monster, but of the man who made it!

6. "The Myth," on page 42 begins with the words, "The prophet speaks"; there is a superscription after the word *prophet* and a printed footnote: "I can not bring myself to mention his name. He is now dead." Under this Leonard has written:

Josiah Royce, Prof. Philosophy, Harvard Univ.

CHARLES DUFFY

University of Akron

T. S. ELIOT, MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS, AND GUILLAUME DE MACHAUT

Wallace Fowlie, in his brilliant study of T. S. Eliot's poetry 'comme un jeu du temps,' writes of 'East Coker,' in the *Four Quartets*:

Le premier vers: 'In my beginning is my end' et le dernier vers: 'In my end is my beginning' rappellent l'inscription qui se trouvait sur la chaise de Marie, reine d'Écosse: 'En ma fin est mon commencement.' Eliot, par son premier vers, annonce le dilemme temporel de l'homme: le commencement d'une vie humaine est déjà un acheminement vers la fin de cette vie; et par son dernier vers, il constate le paradoxe spirituel de l'homme: la fin de la vie terrestre marque le vrai commencement, celui de l'autre réalité.¹

In the most recent examination of the *Four Quartets*, Raymond Preston repeats this ascription to the motto of Mary, Queen of Scots.²

¹ Wallace Fowlie, 'T. S. Eliot—la poésie comme un jeu du temps,' in *La Pureté dans l'Art*, Montreal, 1941, pp. 78-9.

² Raymond Preston, *'Four Quartets' Rehearsed*, New York and London, 1946, p. 24: "We might call the next Quartet ['East Coker'] 'Variations

There is no question that Mary Stuart embroidered on her chair the motto—there is ample evidence of her accomplishments in embroidery. But behind the chair of Mary stands the figure of Guillaume de Machaut, whose rondel enunciates, with curious anticipation of Eliot's treatment, this 'Theme of Mary, Queen of Scots':

Ma fin est mon commencement
Et mon commencement ma fin

Et teneüre vraiment.
Ma fin est mon commencement.

Mes tiers chans. iij. fois seulement
Se retrograde et ainsi fin.
Ma fin est mon commencement
Et mon commencement ma fin.³

It is interesting to note the play in the fifth and sixth lines, itself like *un jeu du temps*.⁴

It is possible that Mary Stuart's motto had currency in the sixteenth century (and here her tutelage by Ronsard should certainly be borne in mind), though Machaut himself seems not to have been well known at this time. About Mr. Eliot there is no uncertainty: he has stated⁵ that he has certainly never read this poem. But Machaut's poem establishes the theme evoked by Eliot's lines with greater validity than the simple motto 'En ma fin est mon commencement' embroidered on Mary's chair.

R. J. SCHOECK

Princeton, New Jersey

on a Theme of Mary, Queen of Scots'; for although the poem begins with an inversion of the theme, the motto stated in its original form at the end informs and unifies the whole pattern. . . ."

³ Machaut, *Poésies Lyriques*, ed. V. Chichmaref, Paris, 1909, II, 575.

⁴ Of this 'canonically written rondeau' Paul Henry Lang writes (*Music in Western Civilization*, New York, 1941, p. 155) that "it marks a step beyond the simple *chace* and leads to the intricate canonic art which was to appear in the following century. It is a composition of complicated construction, written so that all three voices are capable of double employment, that is, they may be sung either forward or backward."

⁵ In a private letter, January, 1947.

A. E. HOUSMAN AND THE NEW PREFECT OF THE
AMBROSIAN

In the year 1910 the late Alfred Housman contributed to the *Classical Review*¹ a brief critique of Msgr. Achille Ratti's monograph on some fragments of an ancient codex of Juvenal recently discovered in the Ambrosian Library. With the new prefect's general conclusions Housman picks no quarrel, but in a final paragraph he reveals both his humanity and his inhumanity:

It was a fine August morning which placed in Monsignore Ratti's hand the envelope containing this fragment, and he gives us leave to imagine the trepidation with which he opened it and the joy with which he discovered that the parchment was in two pieces instead of one. When a scholar is so literary as all this, it would be strange if he were quite accurate: accordingly his transcript of the text has three misprints in its second line; he quotes from the *Classical Review* of 1809; he has discovered, and frequently cites, an edition of Juvenal by J. P. Postgate; Friedlander's edition he provides with *Aumer Kungen*, and confers on Mr Chatelain the baptismal name of Hemilius.

At least three of the errors which Housman cites ("1809" for "1909"; "*Aumer Kungen*" for "*Anmerkungen*"; "Hemilius" for "Aemilius") are so obvious as to suggest the possible peccability of "Adam sciveyn." But it cannot be denied that the prefect was peculiarly unfortunate in attributing an edition of Juvenal to J. P. Postgate; for though the latter was the general editor of the series in which it appeared, its particular editor was none other than our modest reviewer himself!

All his Latinity shrunk to the two narrow words, he now lies buried in Ludlow churchyard under a horizontal slab inscribed "Hic Jacet A. E. H." He who was ever a Salopian in sympathy is at long last one by local habitation. As for the sometime prefect, the simple Latin legend on his tomb in the grotto of St. Peter's tells us that he died Pius XI.

ROBERT J. KANE

Ohio State University

¹ xxiv, 161.

OVID'S MULBERRY IN MILTON'S *PRO SE DEFENSIO*

Milton uses the following scrap of Latin verse:

Poma alba ferebat,
Qui post nigra tulit Morus (Col. ed., ix, 208).

It is adapted from Ovid:

An, quae poma alba ferebat,
Ut nunc nigra ferat contactu sanguinis arbor (*Met.* 4. 51-2).

The tree is identified as the mulberry or *morus* (*Met.* 4. 90), and the second line is adapted to fit it to Milton's attack on Alexander More (*Morus*).

ALLAN H. GILBERT

Duke University

REVIEWS

English Literature in the Seventeenth Century. 1600-1660. By DOUGLAS BUSH. Oxford: OUP, 1945. Pp. vi + 621. \$7.50.

Chapters eight, nine, ten, and twelve, dealing respectively with political, scientific, and religious thought, and with Milton, are the outstanding features of this book. Its great omission, for which its title gives no warning, is the drama. Its scheme does not admit Shakespeare the dramatist though it salutes Shakespeare the Christian humanist and bearer of the tradition that "comes from Plato and Cicero down through Erasmus and others to such men as Spenser, Hooker, Daniel, Chapman, and Jonson." Jonson appears only as poet, epigrammatist, and critic, and the most interesting reference to his plays recalls that in his dedication of *Volpone* to the Two Universities he defended the doctrine that a great poet is first of all a good man. His epigrams (the "ripest" of his studies) and poems, viewed in the light of *Timber*, are seen as the offspring of his ethical conception of art—"a strong, massive, symmetrical pyramid, if not 'a Star-ypointing' one." Bush acknowledges that Jonson is almost a stranger to the realms of 'Full fathom five' and 'The Retreat,' and to the unquiet regions that were within the range of Donne's "cynical or passionate dramatic force," but he warns Donne's "modern devotees" that they "have seldom grasped the breadth and depth of Spenser, Jonson, and Milton."

Donne's modern devotees may well object to the campaign

against them in almost every chapter of this book. Idolators like the girl and hierophants like the professor in Mark Schorer's story "Boy in Summer Sun" will accuse Bush of bad taste. Revaluators who "compare bits of *Paradise Lost* with the short pieces of the metaphysical poets or with the dramatic texture of Shakespeare" will resent his fair charge that they are idlers. Some unfairness may be read by most of us into his contrast of Donne's metaphor of the new-discovered America as applied to a woman's body with Bacon's use of it to symbolize the discoveries of Science and with Spenser's application of it to his ideal fairyland. Few of those who are entitled to an opinion will challenge Bush's preference for the piety of Bishop Andrewes' prayers to the "repetitious expansiveness," the "masochistic exhibitionism" and the "brooding, agitated egoism and unrestraint" of Donne's *Devotions*, or his aspersion of Donne's religious love and wonder as less genuine than Sir Thomas Browne's. To call the spiritual nourishment of Donne's sermons thin in comparison with Whichcote's *Aphorisms* gives the latter an edge that is perhaps mainly due to their genre. But Bush does not wage a sniping campaign and he challenges openly on the main ground that, "while the greatest artists dominate and unify experience, . . . Donne's fragments of experience remain fragments, . . . his sensibility is not unified but multiple." Believing that Donne's wit was too often the voice of "the discontents and libertine consolations of intellectuals who had outgrown the old verities," Bush attacks the "standard dogma of our time" that "Donne embodied the unified sensibility that Milton was to split up." He refuses to consider Donne the poet apart from Donne the theologian, priest, and courtier, and so he cannot understand why "Donne's orthodoxy and uniformity should appeal less to the modern mind than Milton's independent creed."

In spite of his prosecution of Donne for the weaknesses that modern taste has misvalued, no one knows better than Bush how to use Donne's "wit, intensity, learning, and intellectual pressure" or his "personal intimacy, everyday realism, and verbal and metrical power" as touchstones in measuring other metaphysicals. Though his recognition of the unmatched power of metaphysical poetry to embody the "sensuous apprehension of thought," may not satisfy its admirers, he insists no more firmly than does the carefully impartial Robert Sharp (in *From Donne to Dryden*) that subjectivity and indifference to general truths are metaphysical characteristics, or that metaphysical wit died of its own excesses before *Paradise Lost* was born. Bush's contempt for the "pernicious anaemia of the secular metaphysical muse, dwindling from cosmic audacities to pretty, labored, eccentric artifice," may do some injustice to the "Mob of Gentlemen who wrote with Ease," but when he comes to a great talent like Marvell's he does not yield to Mr. Leavis in perception of why it is that the *Horatian Ode* is a "perfect triumph of civilization, unique in English." It is instructive to compare Mr.

Leavis' unfavorable comparison of *Comus* with the *Dialogue between the Resolved Soul and Created pleasure* (in *Revaluation*, p. 28) on the ground of Marvell's fusion of a wide range of maturely valued interests in his wit and of his "seriousness, the finer wisdom of a ripe civilization," with Bush's more relevant location of the *Dialogue* relatively to Donne and Vaughan in the metaphysical tradition and in the tradition of Platonic humanism relatively to the fable of the "Choice of Hercules," with its roots reaching back to Prodicus and its topmost branch ending in Cowley's *The Soul*.

Another comparison between *English Literature in the Seventeenth Century* and *Revaluation* may be drawn on the basis of Mr. Leavis' protest against the stubborn survival, "in spite of the recent readjustment of perspective" upon "Mr. Waller's service in reforming our numbers," of the view that the line of development of the heroic couplet stretches from Waller to Denham, to Dryden, to Pope. "The line," says Mr. Leavis, one-dimensionally still, "runs from Ben Jonson (and Donne) through Carew to Marvell to Pope." Bush's interest in the evolution of the couplet is two- or three-dimensional. He sees it "forwarded by the translators of the ancient elegiac distich like Marlowe and Heywood" and especially Sandys "in his *Ovid*, seeking literalness and compression more than ornament" and contributing to the "development of neo-classical poetic diction" hardly less than did Drayton in the often closed and antithetical couplets of *England's Heroical Epistles*. Beside Jonson we see a minor figure like Sir John Beaumont making his symptomatic contribution to the evolution of the closed couplet and in the critical dimension advancing it through the verse-essay, *To his late Majesty, concerning the True Form of English Poetry*. In the practice of the couplet we are reminded that Denham and Godolphin stood beside Waller, whose indebtedness to Fairfax was familiar to Dryden. And beside Fairfax and the others already named Bush sees the couplet as stemming from troops of minors; Hall, Drummond, Sylvester, Henry King, Lord Falkland, Cartwright, and more. Mr. Leavis' "line" has become a stream fed by half the poetic springs of the century though among those springs Donne is not included.

The basic evolutionary problem of the century as Bush regards it is the cultural change lying roughly between Peacham's "emphasis on religion and virtue united with good letters and knightly exercises and his constant appeal to classical precept and example" in the *Complete Gentleman* (1622) and Francis Osborn's repudiation of the "humanistic ideal in the interest of practical experience, mundane utility and success, and Chesterfieldian *savoir faire*" in the *Advice to a Son* (1656). No thesis is formulated and there is no attempt to indict a nation or an age, but the drift is clear in the cross-currents of the character which finally abandon Earle's admirable Polonian old man and his "immortal Hodge," so unlike "the peasant of modern fiction, since he has 'reason enough to doe

his business, and not enough to be idle or melancholy.'” Bush is frank in his preference for the early essayists and character-writers, “who rarely scrutinize the fundamentals of orthodox religion and morality,” to Samuel Butler, Osborn, and Richard Whitlock, the sceptics who learned more from Montaigne and Charron than they did from Bacon.

The treatment of Bacon is rather tender. While recognizing that his dream of a scientific *Summa* was scholastic and rhetorical and that “many illustrations of his idols can be found in his . . . natural histories,” Bush, though he refers vaguely to Whitehead, essentially contradicts Whitehead’s assertion that by thinking “qualitatively and not quantitatively” Bacon “completely missed the tonality which lay behind the success of seventeenth century science.”¹ While acknowledging Bacon’s mathematical shortcoming Bush sees him as representing “a transitional phase of escape from the medieval qualitative conception of matter,” and as “a link between Campanella and Leibniz” (though not between Galileo and Newton), thanks to “his fusion of a limited mechanism with dynamism.”² Thus Bacon is saved from the charge of Baconianism and we hear nothing but the tragic irony in his hope; “Only let the human race recover the right over nature which belongs to it by divine bequest, and let power be given it; the exercise thereof will be governed by sound reason and true religion.” It is left for the Cartesians and finally for Hobbes, “the new Protagoras, who made absolute Bacon’s divorce between philosophy and religion,” to sever “the golden chain that bound nature and man to God.”³

Bush’s sympathy both in the chapters on science and religion is with the men who, like the later Cambridge Platonists and Milton, tried and failed to repair the broken chain. He sets the Cambridge group in the main stream of philosophy by making them “the founders of British idealism,” and sees in their doctrine of right reason something like a final justification for Henry More’s faith in “a perpetual peace and agreement betwixt Truth & Truth, be they of what nature or kind soever.” Bush accepts the implications of his attachment to the Cambridge men for the history of philosophy generally, and does not hesitate to move Lord Herbert of Cherbury, “the Bacon of metaphysics and epistemology,” out of the main stream though in an earlier chapter his “real importance in the history of philosophy” is acknowledged.

¹ A. N. Whitehead, *Science and the Modern World*, New York, 1925, p. 66.

² *English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century*, p. 266. Perhaps the best justification of Bush’s statement to be found in Bacon is that in *Novum Organum*, II, viii, and the discussion of the doctrine of forms in II, ix, but to the present writer they seem inconclusive. Perhaps the best support for Bush’s view is to be found in Bacon’s conception of heat as involving motion.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 349. Cf. the final word of regret there that modern “religions of man and nature . . . cut loose from the seventeenth century Platonists’ deep roots of Christian faith and right reason.”

It would be quite unfair to imply that Bush makes any pretense of rewriting the history of philosophy anent science, religion, or even politics. The best features of his eighth chapter are its recognition of the intrinsic interest of the Puritan vision of a Christian society and its meaning for literature, its analysis of a changing Calvinism as a kind of literary substratum, and its tracing of the roots of the Puritan revolution to Catholicism and continental Protestantism. Bush does not entirely sympathize with the middle class revolutionists who asserted "their economic, political, and religious claims against a royalist and Anglican regime," and he refuses to regard the man who is becoming more and more the hero and saint of the movement from which he stood so largely apart, Gerald Winstanley, as in any degree a Marxist precursor. Quite rightly Winstanley is put into "the long line of Christian communists who had pleaded for the underdog since the Middle Ages."

The finest chapter in the book is the last one, which treats Milton both as artist and thinker. It is both a clear distillate of everything in modern Miltonic scholarship and a cogent defense of the position with which Bush's readers are already familiar in *Paradise Lost in Our Time*. For the facile ironists who smile at Milton for ingeminating that his "theme . . . is somewhere above him, and he must obtain an 'answerable style'" and who frown at him for justifying "God's punishing us for becoming what at our best we are" Bush's pleading of the case may not be satisfactory. They must, however, be a little grateful to him for so brilliant a challenge to their condescension to 'the noble voice.'

This review would be a disservice to all who may be interested in the present volume of the Oxford Histories of English Literature if it did not mention the very useful Chronological Tables of public events, literary history, verse, prose, and drama (pp. 405-439) and the invaluable bibliography (pp. 440-610).

MERRITT Y. HUGHES

University of Wisconsin

Hamlet without Tears. By I. J. SEMPER. Dubuque, Iowa: The Loras College Press, 1946. Pp. 107. \$1.50.

Prefaces to Shakespeare. By HARLEY GRANVILLE-BARKER. Volume I. Hamlet, King Lear, The Merchant of Venice, Antony and Cleopatra, Cymbeline. Volume II. Othello, Coriolanus, Julius Caesar, Romeo and Juliet, Love's Labour's Lost. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1946, 1947. Pp. viii + 543, viii + 449. \$5.00 each.

Mr. Semper's oddly-named book on *Hamlet* consists of six semi-detached essays. In one of them he rejects, quite properly, the

idea that Shakespeare implanted a controversy over the nature of ghosts in his play. In another he discusses the prayer scene, excusing Hamlet's "shocking" soliloquy as emanating from a momentarily unbalanced mind. In a third he argues cogently against the skepticism sometimes imputed to Hamlet without attaining equal success in imputing orthodoxy instead. In another he considers Hamlet as an embodiment of the Renaissance ideal of the gentleman. The nearest thing to a central idea is, I think, his theory that the ghost as a visitor from purgatory is the agent of divine justice rather than of blood revenge. This thesis is part of what seems to be the principal aim of the book—to capture *Hamlet* for Thomism.

Mr. Semper's book is thoughtful, moderate, and intelligent. It is welcome for calling attention once again to the unique spiritual (*theological* is Mr. Semper's word) implications of *Hamlet*, which confronts death and broods over it as no other tragedy of Shakespeare's does. But it does not illuminate the play very brightly. I do not say so because I would quarrel with its arguments or its conclusions. Some of them I do think decidedly dubious,¹ but if they were impeccable I should still say so. I say so because I think that we shall never pluck out the heart of Hamlet's mystery by rationalizing the play. Indeed, we shall never pluck out the heart of Hamlet's mystery, and there is not much use in trying. A play—above all, a poetic tragedy—is not a theorem; it is an experience, or, as Sir Harley Granville-Barker puts it, a magic spell. To compress it within logical or rational dimensions is to tarnish its grandeur, to clip its wings. *Hamlet* is not medieval and orthodox and Thomistic; it is medieval and Renaissance and modern, orthodox and skeptical, Thomistic and naturalistic—it is everything. It may not satisfy the mind unless one makes a careful selection from its multitudinousness, as Mr. Semper (among many others) has done, but to expect satisfaction of the mind rather than exhilaration of the whole being is the capital fallacy of literary criticism. We are only playing a solemn game with ourselves when we put the strait-jacket of a formula on a work of art like *Hamlet* to which

¹ I question the assumption that parallels from St. Thomas to utterances from the play prove something. To Mr. Semper they prove that "*Hamlet* is fundamentally medieval in outlook," that "In *Hamlet* the Church is the visible representative of the supernatural" (p. 97). Discussing Hamlet's "profound reverence" for the angels, he even cites Marcellus's remark about the ghost, "For it is as the air, invulnerable," as a reflection of the views of St. Thomas on the corporality of spirits. What does Mr. Semper suppose that non-Catholic ghosts are made of? To me the parallels illustrate the fact that the *Summa*, like the Thirty-nine Articles or the Heidelberg Catechism, is mostly an exposition of fundamentals on which all branches of Christianity are agreed. I question the usefulness of the kind of argument to which Mr. Semper has recourse on p. 55. Since the ghost returns from purgatory and is therefore assured of salvation, when Hamlet, in the prayer scene, "virtually regards his father's spirit as a lost soul" Hamlet must be mad.

the spectator's imagination responds far more ardently than his reason.

On this account I prefer the criticism of Sir Harley Granville-Barker (who, by the bye, says flatly that Shakespeare "cannot, if he would, meddle with theology"). The series of nine prefaces which he published in England between 1927 and 1945, plus a new one on *Coriolanus*, have now appeared in this country in a handsome two-volume edition. Since in twenty years or less they have been widely recognized as one of the most distinguished discussions of Shakespeare's art of our time, it is perhaps more necessary to call attention to their accessibility to American readers than to reassess them.

A few words should be said about the preface to *Coriolanus*, however, but not many, for it is all of a piece with the others. It is a full, alert, and suggestive analysis, keenly alive to the impressions that will be and must be made upon an audience. It is full of provocative asides; the footnotes on the stage-directions are here especially stimulating. It rides the author's favorite hobby-horse, his idea that in the later plays Shakespeare could command the services of actors capable of far more subtlety than their predecessors of the nineties, and I must say gives his notion some stout support. If there is none of the brilliance that distinguishes some of Granville-Barker's observations on *Antony and Cleopatra* or *Lear*, it is no doubt because *Coriolanus* is the most unequivocal of Shakespeare's mature plays and does not yield so rich a return to sympathetic perception as most of the other tragedies.

The familiar prefaces stand up well under rereading. It is true that Granville-Barker is not above a bit of rationalizing himself; he even finds deep meanings in the snatches of the ballad of Jephtha which Hamlet quotes, and at p. 258, after considerable ratiocination in a manner unlike that of his earlier discussion of the play, he brings forth "the master-clue to Hamlet's 'mystery.'" He has a weakness for sweeping statements, such as that the spiritual issues of *Hamlet* would not "touch the conscience of the positive eighteenth century" or that Shakespeare "cannot, if he would, meddle with theology," and for large assumptions, such as those which underlie his somewhat magisterial pronouncements, apropos of *Cymbeline*, on the quiddity of private-theater plays and playing. He gives the impression of being ill at ease in discussing technical problems like the integrity of the text of *Cymbeline*, and what he says is less illuminating than usual. He is, perhaps inevitably, more successful with some plays than with others. Pride of place and almost half of one volume go to the preface to *Hamlet*, but I should not put it at the top of the scale of merit. It is notorious that no one really likes anybody else's idea of *Hamlet*, but Granville-Barker's concept of the prince as "a human soul adrift" seems no more likely to gain a convert or two than the rest.

But all these niggling reservations are a very light counterpoise

to the solid merits of Granville-Barker's work. The greatest merit of all is seeing the plays as wholes, as stories acted, and tracing their power to their dramatic and theatrical values. This sharpening of the critical focus is, I believe, Granville-Barker's greatest service, greater than his elucidations of speeches, scenes, and plays, valuable as these often are. Unless I misread the signs, these prefaces seem likely to have a lasting effect upon our attitude toward Shakespeare's plays; in the future we shall less often look at them through the haze of Hegelian metaphysics, medieval cosmology, Galenic physiology, or Elizabethan politics rather than in the clear light of the stage where they were born. Granville-Barker has done more than any one else to take the critic of Shakespeare out of his book-lined study and put him into a seat on the aisle, or a stool in the pit, and that is a real and an honorable achievement.

M. A. SHAABER

University of Pennsylvania

Li Compilacions de le science des estoilles, Books I-III. By LEOPOLD OF AUSTRIA. Edited from MS French 613 of the Bibliothèque Nationale, with Notes and Glossary, by FRANCIS J. CARMODY. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1947. (*University of California Publications in Modern Philology*. Volume XXXIII, No. 2, pp. i-iv + 35-102, one figure in text.)

Professor Francis J. Carmody, who has already edited various didactic treatises in Old French and in Mediaeval Latin, now offers a partial edition of the Old French translation of a Latin tract. Leopold, son of the Duke of Austria, composed the *Compilatio de astrorum scientia* in 1271 or shortly thereafter. Quite modestly he disclaimed all originality: "Let no one ask for the name of the author, since there have been several, not just one; I am merely their faithful and diligent compiler." The Latin text was published by the renowned printer Erhard Ratdolt at Venice in 1489. An anonymous French translation of it was made sometime before 1324. The terminus ad quem is absolute, because the first owner of the manuscript, Marie de Luxembourg, died in that year. This manuscript, now catalogued as Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds français 613, has preserved the only extant copy of *Li Compilacions de le science des estoilles*.

The main stricture that a reviewer can make about this edition, admirable in many ways, is that it is incomplete. The justification offered for stopping at Book III is that the other books are as-

trological rather than astronomical. Only a complete edition would enable the reader to appraise the enthusiastic descriptions of the French translation: "With the sole exception of Alfonso el Sabio's *Libros del Saber de Astronomia*, the most extensive known treatment of this science in the vernacular. . . . More interesting than the Latin original, especially for its intricate vocabulary" (pages 37 and 45). Now the addition of the other books would hardly have doubled the size of this short monograph; in fact, one wonders (because of the description given on page 48) whether Books ix and x have been preserved at all. Be that as it may, the paucity of scientific allusions to the many manuscripts or to the printed text of the *Compilatio* and the fact, indicated clearly by the editor himself, that many of the technical terms found in *Li Compilacions* had been used by Hagin le Juif in 1273, make the reader chary about sharing the editor's enthusiasm. Inasmuch as Hagin was dealing primarily with judicial astrology, it is quite plausible that the vocabulary of the unedited portion bears a striking similarity to that of the portion now passing in review.

Hagin's translation of Abraham ibn Ezra exists in two manuscripts, which are mentioned by Carmody and which are preserved in the fonds français of the Bibliothèque Nationale. The original bears the call-number 24276, of which a rotograph copy is owned by the University of Illinois. On page 51 it is said to contain also Abû Ma'shar's *Nativités*. It would be more accurate to say that folios 100v-103v contain only the first sixth of it. The treatise is entirely lacking in the copy of that manuscript, which was made by Viennot Pingot in Paris in 1477 and which now bears the call-number 1351. Then again, Carmody notes (on page 48) that, in the omnibus manuscript 613, *Li Compilacions* is followed immediately by *Les Jugemens des estoilles*, of which the first part is reproduced in MS. 1352, and also by *L'Introductoire d'astronomie*, which was composed ca. 1270 and which is preserved also in MS. 1353 (cited indirectly in note 47 and on page 50). His reference to the precession of the equinoxes in the latter work shows that its author was dependent upon Ptolemy.¹ His frequent mentions of manuscript sources amounts to a comprehensive catalogue of astrological treatises in Old French.

Recently critical editions were made of the Old Italian and Old Dutch adaptations of *Le Livre de Sidrach*. Carmody comments, on page 39, that the Old French text has not been edited since 1528. His plea for a modern edition may be answered soon by one of Professor Holmes's students, Miss H. S. Treanor, who is using three manuscripts and two fragments. As for Nicole Oresme's translation in 1360 of *Le Quadripartit de Ptolomee*, for which Carmody was forced to consult manuscripts (on page 47), it is

¹ Cf. U. T. Holmes, Jr., *History of Old French Literature* (New York, 1937), p. 243.

heartening to learn that Professor A. D. Menut has gone abroad to complete an edition of it. Carmody gives the same date of 1360 (on page iv) for Jean de Corbichon's translation of *Le Propriétaire des choses* par Barthélemy de Glanville, but in the title of the incunabulum of it,² one finds "l'an de grace 1372." Carmody consulted the J. Pierpont Morgan MS. in New York; yet one may borrow a microfilm of the Brussels MS. from the Modern Language Association.

On that same page iv, he lists his sigla. They do not follow any pattern consistently, and they were hardly devised for mnemonic effect. Nor do the numerous abbreviations added in the glossary facilitate the comprehension of the intricate vocabulary of technical terms in various languages. I wish to add several minor suggestions in the hope that they may enhance a bit the serviceableness of this welcome edition.

The extensive bibliography is up-to-date with a few exceptions: in note 8, for a recent allusion to Richard de Fournival's *Biblionomie*, cf. *Isis*, xxxvii (1947), p. 154; in note 52, which concerns the enigmatic Bethem, cf. *Isis*, xxxv (1944), p. 299; in note 55, anent the well known Arnoul de Quinquempoix, cf. E. Wickersheimer, *Dictionnaire biographique des médecins en France au moyen âge*, I (Paris, 1936), p. 52. I guess that the reading *mustees* on page 50 is a repetition of an error for *muscees* used adjectively in the sense of "secret." There need be no difficulty about interpreting a passage on page 63; apparently *cumchiement d'ordure* is found in the manuscript as *cächement d'ordure*; the Latin original *inquinatio* solves the problem, and reminds one of the obscenity in *Le Livre des Machabees*: "E comanda . . . que lor armes fussent conchiees de totes ordures et de chonchiementz."³ A query is raised as to whether *escu* on page 67 means "whip" or "horse;" it is equated with Latin *scutica*, *scutica*, *stutica* and with Germanic *stut*. I venture to suggest the Latin equivalent *scutata*, and to see in *escu* the obvious meaning of "shield." This representation of "Uns hons jovenes en le main du quel il a un escu" can be compared with that of *Le Commencement de sapience*: "Un fort qui a un glaive en sa mein senestre."⁴ The word *hautaiche* on page 77 eluded Carmody, who wonders if it is an error; the context makes it clear that "le souveraine hautaiche" denotes the upper altitude or the zenith.⁵ The references given on pages 93 as 1—2—112-4—8—15 should be reduced to a single reference 1—4—15. On page 96 *ennap* "goblet" can not serve as the translation of *navis*, and the paleographic emendation, proposed on page 69, is unnecessary; the Latin original for *ennap* might be *vas*, while *navis* merely proves that "li nachele Argon" signifies the constellation Argo Navis. Finally the line in the glossary on page 100, which reads "*repus* adj. 1—3—1 (*occultus*) probably for *repous* from *repandre*," can be deleted by recalling the numerous examples in Old French literature of *repus* as the past participle of *repondre*.⁶

² L. Thorndike, *Dates in Intellectual History: The Fourteenth Century* (New York, 1945), p. 44.

³ E. Goerlich, *Die Beiden Bücher der Makkabäer* (Halle am Salle, 1888), I, 51.

⁴ *The Johns Hopkins Studies in Rom. Lit. and Lang.*, extra volume xiv (1939), 41.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 94.

⁶ Godefroy, VII, 63a. The use of this word in MS. 1353 deluded P. Duhem, *Le Système du monde*, III (Paris, 1915), p. 150.

The general impression to be derived from a perusal of the printed text is that Books I and II emphasize astronomy, while the Prologue and Book III put the accent on astrology. The opinion of Dr. George Sarton⁷ that the Middle Ages did not draw a sharp line between science and superstition is confirmed fully by the definition of astrology and of astronomy given by Leopold himself. It is reproduced here on page 37 in Latin, with the remark that it was quoted long ago by Conradus Noricus, and on page 56 in Old French. Since the same fusion may be anticipated in the unpublished books, historians of science and French philologists will be very grateful to Professor Carmody if he will apply his erudition and his perspicacity to make accessible the entire text of *Li Compilacions de le science des estoilles*.⁸

RAPHAEL LEVY

The University of Texas

Poèmes. Par PIERRE DE RONSARD, Choisis et commentés par A. BARBIER. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1946. Pp. xx + 204.

Sonnets pour Hélène. Par PIERRE DE RONSARD. Edition critique publiée par JACQUES LAVAUD. Paris: Droz, 1947. Pp. xxiv + 157.

La publication d'une anthologie pose immédiatement la question suivante: le choix des pièces retenues se justifie-t-il? Quel est le but poursuivi par le compilateur? Ce dernier a-t-il voulu donner une idée de l'ensemble de la production ronsardienne, ou bien a-t-il cherché à dégager et à mettre en lumière les poèmes qui lui plaisaient le plus? Est-ce d'histoire littéraire ou d'esthétique qu'il s'agit? Ou bien encore a-t-il été possible de concilier ces deux disciplines?

Quand Sainte-Beuve publia les *Œuvres Choiesies de Pierre de Ronsard*, c'était avec l'intention de réhabiliter le maître de la Pléiade. 'Avec la sagacité du critique et du poète,' dit L. Moland, Sainte-Beuve 'avait, dans l'œuvre touffue du vieux lyrique, recueilli la fleur, l'élite, [...] ce qui mérite de devenir plus ou moins classique.' Et Sainte-Beuve, lui-même, déclara, dans la

⁷ *Introduction to the History of Science: From Rabbi Ben Ezra to Roger Bacon*, II (Baltimore, 1931), p. 760; cf. Carmody, *Progress Med. Rev. Studies U. S.*, XVIII (1944), p. 23.

⁸ Chronologically it is related to Nicolas de La Horbe's translation of the astrological treatises, which Guido de Bonatti had composed in Latin in the thirteenth century. The statement (made on page 40 and repeated on page 44) that the *Livre nommé introduction* was not translated into a modern language until the fifteenth century rests upon the date of the Arsenal MS., not upon the year of composition, which is given as 1327 in *Hist. lit. Fr.*, XXIV (1862), 485, and XXXV (1921), 630.

préface de 1828: 'J'ose espérer que le choix qu'on va lire sera définitif.' Cet espoir ne fut pas déçu. Les recueils des œuvres de Ronsard qu'on a donnés depuis imitent plus ou moins, en effet, celui du grand critique. Les éditeurs qui se sont succédé ont bien pu ajouter ou retrancher telle ou telle pièce, ou donner à leur anthologie plus de développement, mais le travail de Sainte-Beuve a servi de base aux nouvelles compilations. C'est ainsi qu'Alphonse Sédou a suivi son devancier, tout en réduisant le nombre des poèmes choisis par Sainte-Beuve et en ajoutant les deux sonnets 'libres' de Ronsard. L. Becq de Fouquières et A. Noël ont joint, aux pièces traditionnellement transmises, des extraits de la *Franciade* et des *Mascarades*. H. Longnon a conçu les deux volumes de *La Fleur des Poésies et des Musiciens de Ronsard* 'pour faire mieux connaître, pour faire chanter, pour faire aimer le Prince des Poètes français.' P. de Nolhac a donné un ouvrage plus ample que celui de Sainte-Beuve et il a placé les pièces dans un ordre original: 'Le choix,' a-t-il dit, 'a été guidé surtout par des raisons de goût littéraire, quelquefois par l'intérêt historique, très rarement par la pure curiosité.'

M. Barbier a recueilli quelques-unes des pièces des *Amours* de 1552 sur lesquelles l'attention avait déjà été attirée et il y a joint des sonnets moins connus mais qui sont tous intéressants. Il a réduit le nombre des pièces de la *Continuation des Amours* et il a négligé celles des *Sonnets et Madrigals pour Astrée*. Par contre, il a donné une place importante aux *Sonnets pour Hélène*. Mais, ce qui nous paraît moins satisfaisant, c'est le nombre des pages qu'il a consacrées aux odes comme aux discours et aux élégies. Quant aux hymnes, ce sont évidemment des poèmes curieux; mais ils contiennent des longueurs. N'était-il donc pas possible de détacher, de ces hymnes, des épisodes; de citer des extraits; de relever de beaux vers et de laisser le reste? Mais c'est là affaire de goût. Le choix qu'on peut faire des œuvres de Ronsard dépend de l'opinion qu'on a de son art. Si l'on croit avec Gérard de Nerval que la *Pléiade* a triomphé 'dans tous les genres de poésie gracieuse et légère,' on cherchera à rassembler les petites odes de Ronsard qui 'semblent la plupart inspirées plutôt par les chansons du XII^e siècle'; on gardera ses sonnets et quelques-unes de ses élégies, les pièces où 'l'imitation classique est moins sensible'; on délaissera les compositions où Ronsard a voulu introduire 'tous ces noms de déités grecques qui passent au peuple, pour qui est faite la poésie, pour autant de galimatias, de barbarismes et de paroles de grimoire,' comme l'a écrit Chapelain dans une lettre à Balzac (27 mai 1640).

Disons aussi qu'on aurait pu désirer que M. Barbier eût retenu les pages où Ronsard a exprimé ses idées sur la poésie. Déjà Sainte-Beuve, qui n'avait donné aucun échantillon des vers de la *Franciade*, avait publié des extraits de la seconde 'Préface,' et L. Moland y avait ajouté l'*Abrégé de l'art poétique français*. Remarquons encore que, dans le travail curieux et intéressant qu'il a consacré à

Cassandre ou le secret de Ronsard, M. Sorg avait attiré l'attention sur l'année 1543, date à laquelle Ronsard reçut la tonsure. C'est par le récit de cet événement que M. Barbier commence l'histoire de la vie du poète, sans, d'ailleurs, accepter toutes les thèses de M. Sorg, et sans, non plus, citer le livre de ce dernier. M. Barbier n'a pas davantage, dans sa bibliographie, signalé la thèse de A.-M. Schmidt sur *La poésie scientifique en France au seizième siècle* (Paris, 1938).

L'excellente édition critique¹ que donne M. Lavaud est précédée d'une introduction sur laquelle nous voudrions dire quelques mots. M. Lavaud cite, en l'approuvant, un passage de la seconde édition de la *Vie de Ronsard* par Claude Binet où celui-ci déclare que Ronsard s'est aidé du nom d'Hélène de Surgères, 'de sa vertu et de sa beauté pour embellir ses vers, et luy a cette gentille Damoiselle servy de blanc, pour viser et non pour tirer ou atteindre.' Et M. Lavaud me semble avoir exprimé une opinion fort juste quand il a dit des relations de Ronsard et d'Hélène: 'Cette liaison, à vrai dire, comme la plupart des *Amours* chantées par les poètes de l'époque, semble n'avoir guère été qu'un jeu poétique.' Ronsard 'est-il devenu réellement, sincèrement amoureux d'Hélène? Nous ne le savons pas, et nous ne pouvons pas le savoir. Peu importe, d'ailleurs. Tout ce que Ronsard a mis d'émotion dans *Hélène*, c'est dans son amour pour la vie, pour la beauté, pour l'amour lui-même qu'il faut le rechercher.' Que pouvons-nous, en effet, demander aux œuvres poétiques de ce temps? Non pas de nous donner des renseignements, assez incertains, sur les aventures amoureuses de leurs auteurs, mais bien plutôt de créer en nous un état poétique.

MARCEL FRANÇON

Harvard University

The Works of Claude Boyer. By CLARA CARNELSON BRODY. New York: King's Crown Press, 1947. Pp. iv + 167.

Some dissertations make substantial contributions to knowledge; others are accepted because of the training their composition is supposed to have given to the student. This book belongs in the latter class, except for the fourteen pages on the author's life and

¹ Nous regrettons que M. Lavaud n'ait pu citer, dans sa bibliographie, l'ouvrage fondamental de Mr. James Hutton, *The Greek Anthology in France* (Ithaca, 1946). M. R. Sorg (*Cassandre*, Paris, 1925, p. 235-6) avait publié deux sonnets qu'il prétendait avoir été écrits, l'un par Ronsard, l'autre par Hélène. Mr. H. C. Lancaster (*RHL.*, xxxvi (1929), 574-6, puis dans *Adventures of a Literary Historian*, Baltimore, 1942, p. 166-73) a montré d'une façon qui paraît définitive, que ces sonnets doivent être attribués respectivement à Claude Billard et à Mme de Retz. M. Lavaud, qui avait soutenu le point de vue de M. Sorg dans son *Philippe Desportes* (Paris, Droz, 1936, p. 517-20), doit être félicité de n'avoir pas publié le premier de ces poèmes dans son édition des *Sonnets pour Hélène*.

the sixteen in which his one opera and his non-dramatic verses are discussed. The author devotes almost a third of the remaining pages, over forty of them, to analyzing plays that have already been analyzed. She prides herself on the detail into which she goes, but her analyses would have been more effective if they had been succinct. Nor is the tedium they create alleviated by her strange use in them of the past tense where most scholars would use the present. She also discusses sources that have already been pointed out and adds comments that do little to further knowledge of Boyer. She may even obscure such knowledge by the uncritical manner in which she weighs evidence.

She accepts, for instance, statements made about Boyer's *Judith* in a novel by Lesage that the frères Parfaict quote, and consequently calls this tragedy a "striking failure," a "sudden failure," a "failure almost over night," though she could easily have learned from the *registres* of the Comédie Française that Lesage was mainly guided by his imagination. He says that the play was acted throughout Lent, though, before Easter, it was produced only from March 4 to 18; he declares that its publication caused its failure on the stage, though it was printed too late to justify this conclusion;¹ and he states that it was suddenly dropped, although after Easter it followed the normal course of tragedies, was acted nine times, and was not withdrawn until two of its productions earned less than 350 francs each. It was even given once the following year. To trust a novel in this connection is to mislead the reader.

She sometimes forgets to indicate her own sources and shows so little knowledge of some of them that on p. 158 she mentions a play as attributed to Boyer "by Soleinne in his *Bibliothèque dramatique*," to an anonymous author by "Mahelot." The professor who read her manuscript and whom she never mentions might well have told her that Soleinne was dead when Paul Lacroix catalogued his library, that the list of plays to which she refers was probably not drawn up by Mahelot, and that, as the list names 71 plays and only one author, it is without value in this connection.

Occasionally Dr. Brody seeks to elucidate a problem. I had suggested that *Antigone*, a tragedy that has survived only in manuscript, might be the *Thébaïde* attributed to Boyer by Furetière. Dr. Brody comments (p. 159):

The interjection "Ha" was used almost indiscriminately by enough characters in the play to suggest that it was a favorite expression of the author, but it was an interjection that was hardly ever, if at all, used by any of the characters in any of Boyer's plays.

She is unaware of the fact that "ha" was used interchangeably with "ah" in the seventeenth century.² It was so employed by the

¹ This was pointed out by Fournel, as Dr. Brody notes, p. 84.

² Cf. Littré, s. v. *ha*.

author of *Antigone* and may have appeared in the manuscript of Boyer's published plays. *Antigone* has 13 examples of *ha*, 17 of *ah*, while Boyer's printed *Agamemnon* gives 40 examples of *ah*, many of which may originally have been *ha*. Until Boyer's manuscripts are discovered, no such stylistic argument ought to be advanced.

On pp. 66 and 72 she finds two of Boyer's plots "artificial" because a father and a son love the same woman. I wonder what she thinks of Racine's *Mithridate*. On p. 116 she suggests that Corneille's *Andromède* was influenced by Boyer's *Ulysse*, without taking into consideration what Corneille must have owed to the Italian *Orfeo* that Mazarin had patronized. The date given on p. 97, l. 23, should be 1665, not 1655. I refrain from indicating other misprints except in the case of the word *impostor*, twice spelled *imposter* on p. 40, twice *impostor* on p. 41, and, on p. 43, both ways in a single sentence!

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

The 'Courtisane' in the French Theatre from Hugo to Becque (1831-1885). By SIDNEY D. BRAUN. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1947. Pp. 157. \$2.50. (The Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages, Extra Volume XXII).

Victor Hugo's Acted Dramas and the Contemporary Press. By WILLIAM D. PENDELL. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1947. Pp. 135. \$2.50. (The Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages, Extra Volume XXIII).

Dr. Braun's study was undertaken as a dissertation, although this volume excludes his material on the *théâtre libre*. There is no previous survey of adequate extent dealing with the courtesan in drama; this one covers the field as nearly completely as the need justifies.

In accordance with the author's purpose in showing social and dramatic evolution, the chapter division is according to the classification of the women and the name popularly given each class. Unfortunately, although the author is careful with his terms, the actual distinctions between *lorette*, *cocotte*, and *demi-mondaine* are often doubtful, and the individual differences are greater than the generic ones. Thus the author must show each type as having many of the characteristics already established for preceding ones, and the reader may feel that he has circled back to material of some previous chapter. The *grisette* stands out as a distinct portrayal. The author admits that she is not necessarily venal, but rightly includes her. There is less warrant for including Lucrèce Borgia, for Hugo attributes venality only to her mother.

An attempt to trace through dictionaries the pejorative change in the meaning of *demi-mondaine* seems to me futile. The word was probably used almost immediately as a conscious euphemism and misused soon thereafter. The inexact use was inevitable; it is the decline of the exact use that might be significant.

There is little of value here for the study of the dramatists themselves; concerning them the author quotes critical opinions rather uncritically. On p. 21 he apparently approves Petit de Juleville's statement that Hugo "ne laissait subsister rien de pur que dans les âmes les plus corrompues"—an understandable reaction, but not a true statement. On p. 118 Waxman's designation of *L'Enfant prodigue* as a completely typical *vaudeville* is accepted along with one from Chandler which obviously means that it was not. Reading Arnaoutovitch should have convinced the author that Becque had little in common with Taine and evolutionism. But when the study passes from general comment on Becque to his portrayal of the courtesan, it is more convincing and shows accurately the contrast between Becque's treatment and that of his predecessors.

In sum, the author makes his point: he shows that there were changes in the portrayal of the venal woman at different periods of the century, and that they reflected real social changes. He makes their nature fairly clear. He shows the wide range of plays and characters involved, and yet the limited range of its dramatic treatment before Becque. The conclusions are not surprising, but they are now based on the first careful examination of the field. The study includes a good bibliography and a useful list of plays.

Dr. Pendell's volume is a thoroughly successful presentation of the contemporary critical reaction to Hugo's plays; in fact, it does rather more than the author claims and goes far toward evoking the general atmosphere in which the plays were produced.

As the author states, previous records of the criticism of the press, including the opinions quoted in the definitive edition of Hugo's works, are inadequate, both in extent and in the nature of the passages selected. After comparison with this work, one can see that there has hitherto been too much concern with the temperature of the criticisms and too little with their content. Dr. Pendell has been interested in the standards by which Hugo was judged, the details of the criticism, and whether it was just or unjust. He usually lets the more obvious injustices condemn themselves, but takes pains to show, when necessary, the point to each allusion, to sift the frequent charges of plagiarism, and to serve as a discriminating referee.

That there was much bias will surprise no one; what may be more surprising is to find that many of the attacks condemned Hugo's practice, sincerely or not, on the basis of the theories of the *Préface de Cromwell*. Moreover, despite all partisanship, some of this criticism was valid and discerning and merits rescue from ob-

security not only as exemplifying contemporary attitudes but as criticism in its own right.

An error on p. 39 attributes to Act I of *Hernani* what was really a reference to Act III.

The bibliography is slight for books, but extensive and excellent for the articles on which the study is based.

The book seems the definitive one on its subject, and is one of some importance for all students of Hugo or of the nineteenth-century French theater. It has the further merit of being quite well written.

GIRDLER B. FITCH

The Citadel

Essays by Sir William Cornwallis, the Younger. Edited by DON CAMERON ALLEN. *The Oslerian Texts, I.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1946. Pp. xxiii + 265. \$4.75.

Sir William Cornwallis, the Younger, the first real English essayist, has deserved better treatment than he has received by historians of English literature and the compilers of such biographical collections as the *DNB*. The glaring inaccuracies in the account of Cornwallis in the latter have been corrected, and much new information concerning Cornwallis's life has been discovered, in the last twenty years by Professor R. E. Bennett, Mr. P. B. Whitt, and Mr. C. E. Avery. Professor Allen now gives us for the first time a scholarly edition of Cornwallis's fifty-two essays. It is the first of the Oslerian Texts, published by the Tudor and Stuart Club of the Johns Hopkins University in memory of Sir William Osler, Lady Grace Osler, and Edward Revere Osler. The basis of the new edition is the 1606 text of the first twenty-five essays (which were first published in 1600) and the 1610 text of the second group of twenty-seven essays, of which twenty-four were first published in 1601. There are a biographical and bibliographical introduction, tables of variants, and a commentary on Cornwallis's many quotations and allusions. The text of the *Essays*, which is in singularly bad condition, has been left intact except for the normalization of punctuation and capitals.

Cornwallis has been useful hitherto chiefly to literary historians as a *terminus a quo* for the English essay, and they have been indebted to him for several of the earliest definitions of the form. In his *Essays* he followed the lead of Montaigne, and is thus the true father of the discursive personal and familiar essay in English. The loose collections of jottings that made up the ten pieces in the first edition of Bacon's *Essays* in 1597 seem to have had no influence on Cornwallis. That he was no slavish imitator of Montaigne, however, has been convincingly shown by Professor Bennett. Cornwallis got from Montaigne some very helpful suggestions as to how

a young gentleman might set forth in an easy conversational manner his ideas on moral, social, and other subjects. The young Englishman was, indeed, most like Montaigne in that he expressed his convictions, often very different from those of his master, in as frankly egotistical and honest fashion as did the old Perigourdin gentleman himself. The charm of Cornwallis is that of young manishness, whereas Montaigne wins us with the mellow worldliness of Gallic old age.

Cornwallis probably had little formal education, was innocent of Greek and French (he knew Montaigne only in translation, whether by Florio or not is uncertain), but had a reading knowledge of Spanish and Italian. He had the amateur scholar's enthusiasm for books, and felt at home, as perhaps not every university man could have done, with the personages of classical history. "He played his game well," he says of Caesar. Of Cato he remarks, "this fellow sure was naturally good, but somewhat too well contented to be thought so." His reading was varied and without the benefit of academic guidance. He was young enough to revel in the sententiousness of that "Prince of morality," Seneca, and to prefer the deeds of Alexander and Caesar to the "disease of words let in by Cicero." He had read rather more widely than most young gentlemen or scholars in his day in English literature. He refers to Chaucer and Stowe, and alludes to Shakespeare and other playwrights and to the romances and ballads. Sidney is his favorite, and he speaks with delight of "that masterpiece of English . . . the *Arcadia*." His own English style is, next to Nicholas Breton's perhaps, the most informal and conversational of his day, and he needs almost no annotations to be intelligible to the modern reader.

Cornwallis provides an interesting contrast with Bacon, who shares with him the honor of having started the English essay on its way. His essays "Of Love," "Of Suspicion," and "Of Friendship and Factions," for example, lack the dogmatic and didactic certainty of Bacon's essays on the same topics, as well as Bacon's cold, clear technique of analysis. He is much less given to apophthegms than Bacon, but he can turn a homely aphorism with the best of his contemporaries. "Fame never knew a perpetuall Bedpresser," he remarks in "Of Sleepe." "Leave us in durt, and finde us in durt," he says by way of summarizing his fellow countrymen in comparison with the noble Romans. "Every man musters himselfe in the band of Vertue when there is any pay to be taken, but at the day of battaile, . . . shee hath not a follower." "There is in the multitude a strength more than they know of."

Students of English manners and morals, of social and intellectual standards of the early seventeenth century, as well as of English letters, will find the reading of Cornwallis's *Essayes* in Professor Allen's new edition a profitable and pleasurable experience.

ALEXANDER M. WITHERSPOON

Yale University

John Milton's Complete Poetical Works. Reproduced in Photographic Facsimile. A Critical Text Edition Compiled and Edited by HARRIS FRANCIS FLETCHER. Volume II. Urbana, Illinois: The University of Illinois Press, 1945. Pp. 634. \$20.

Collectors, bibliographers, and students of Milton have long recognized the imperative need of a study of the text of the first edition of *Paradise Lost*. But until Professor Fletcher, no scholar has cared to undertake the onerous task: to solve the problem of assembling sufficient copies, or photographs of copies, to make his study definitive; to collate painstakingly this large number of copies; and finally, to analyze the complex of variants that the collation promised to reveal.

In helping Professor Fletcher in his undertaking, the University of Illinois has been signally generous. That he might have sufficient materials, the library acquired some fifty copies of the first edition (probably one-quarter of those still extant) and photographs of some one hundred additional copies. These materials Professor Fletcher has subjected to a scrutiny that noted even minute variations of type and type position; and his analysis of these and other differences has enabled him to reconstruct in considerable detail the conditions under which the edition was printed and bound, and to offer what appear to be adequate explanations for virtually every variant observed in the edition. In short, the collation in Part II of his study, "The Text of the First Edition," suggests that Professor Fletcher has done his best to justify the confidence and faith placed in him by the great institution that made his work possible.

Similar praise, however, cannot always be accorded Part I of his study. This 216 page "The Composition, Printing, and Publication of the First Edition" contains much extraneous material: Sections I-II, presenting Milton's early plans for an epic, have little, if any, place in an "intensive study" (p. 31) of a book printed in 1667; Section V belongs, at best, in an appendix; and much now in the text of Part I should have been relegated to footnotes. As a consequence, Part I is badly organized. It should properly begin with the material presented in Section IV, with Sections III and VI following; all fifteen sections often lack sufficient transition, cross reference, and significant summation; and paragraph and sentence structure is sometimes surprisingly amorphous. Part I, finally, is not always rigorously accurate¹—a fact that unfortunately not only

¹ On p. 3, Professor Fletcher lists 54 original copies as having been used for collation; but in the subsequent classification of these copies according to title page (pp. 3-5), I find no mention of copies 49, 50, 51, 52, and 54, though p. 165 indicates the use of copy 50, pp. 130, 155, 169 show use of copy 52, and pp. 155, 212 of copy 54. Likewise missing from the classification is copy 70, referred to on p. 212. Pp. 168-69 seem to have been

casts doubt on Part II, but also renders a scrupulous appraisal of Professor Fletcher's volume virtually impossible, as complete facilities for checking are available only at the University of Illinois.

Since the ultimate text of Milton's epic is to be made from the second edition of the poem, controlled by the first and by the manuscript of Book I, there is yet opportunity for a discussion of the text of *Paradise Lost* in which Professor Fletcher may recapitulate much that he has presented badly in volume II of his work. One may hope, then, that in volume III he will add to his energy and industry the virtues of lucid exposition and irreproachable accuracy; for if he does so, his work could become—as volume II certainly will not—a model of textual scholarship.

MAURICE KELLEY

Princeton University

The Fusion of Horatian and Aristotelian Literary Criticism, 1531-1555. By MARVIN T. HERRICK. *Illinois Studies in Language and Literature*, vol. XXXII, no. 1. University of Illinois Press, 1946. Pp. vii + 117. \$1.50.

Modern students who read the critical treatises in chronological order are apt to feel that Horace's *Ars Poetica* represents a distinct comedown from the excellence of Aristotle's *Poetics*. Though such studies as those by Rostagni and Klingner may serve to show them that the *Ars Poetica* has more to offer than is first apparent, they are likely to use whatever they find there as a means of better understanding the *Poetics*.

Not so the students of the Renaissance. As Marvin T. Herrick points out in this scholarly little book, the *Poetics* and *Rhetoric* of Aristotle were studied by the Renaissance commentators to throw light on Horace's poem. By expanding Horace's precepts with Aristotle's observations, they were largely responsible for the formation of sixteenth century criticism. Herrick's purpose is to show in detail when and how this process took place. He declares that

written before certain copies were assigned their present numbers, as 111 is cited as 101, 113 as 103, and 132 as 122. Pp. 3, 5 assign copy 12 the 1669¹ title page; p. 140 reads 1669². Four of the six figures of the table on p. 208 disagree with the totals to be computed from pp. 3-5. Other inaccuracies and omissions include p. 4: "IU" omitted from the library number of copy 53; p. 5: "(Imperfect.)" omitted from the second description of copy 39; p. 152: [L13v] omitted before line number 450, 450 printed in the wrong font, and the readings of 9:968 and 982 reversed, as pp. 153, 566-69 clearly show; p. 153: the discussion of [Oo3r] omits the variant "pray]pray,"; p. 169: "G. 1158" should read "G. 11558" if p. 5 is correct; p. 207: "Ss[r]" should read "Ss2[r]" unless the following line number (10:980 ff.) is incorrect; p. 214: "153-55" should read "152-55."

between 1533 and 1555 the main lines of Renaissance criticism had been laid by such commentators and paraphrasers as Denores, Willichius, Philippus, Madius, and Robertellus.

Actually, Herrick does not stay strictly within the dates given in the title. He makes considerable use of the 1482 commentary on the *Ars Poetica* by Landinus, and the commentary of Lambinus which did not appear until 1561, as well as that of Aldus Manutius Paulus which was published in 1576. Good reasons for these departures may, however, be found in the text. Landinus is used to show how the commentators before the rediscovery of Aristotle used Cicero and the grammarians to interpret Horace. Lambinus and the younger Manutius do not push the dates forward, thinks Herrick, because they are propagating interpretations made by 1555. The quotations from other writers—one is as late as 1924—are used as illustrations of how the opinions formed in the first half of the sixteenth century are echoed later. These illustrations contribute to the interest of this treatise and might well have been expanded into a history of these critical ideas. Indeed, expansion all along the line would have made this book, which teaches but does not always delight, more readable.

Herrick's chapters, which are entitled "Nature and Art," "Poetic Imitation," "The Function of Poetry," "Decorum," "Epic Poetry vs. Tragedy," and "The Dramatic 'Rules,'" show more fully than has ever been shown before how many of the precepts which were handed down to the following generations under the names of Minturno, Scaliger, and Castelvetro may be found in the commentators with whom he deals. For instance, we are shown that except for unity of place all of the so-called rules of the drama had been hinted at, if not fully clarified, by 1555. Thus, Herrick, feels able to conclude that "nearly all the critical precepts that are familiar to students of literary criticism of the late sixteenth, seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries are to be found in these Horatian commentaries. . . ."

To the unwary this sentence might mean both less and more than the author seemingly intended it to mean. It does not merely restate what has long been known: that the Renaissance and Neo-Classical critics borrowed their critical terminology from the ancients, since Herrick's commentators have already begun the process of making these precepts fit the needs of the new civilization. Aristotle's remarks on the difference between the characters of comedy and those of tragedy, for example, are already interpreted by them as demanding a class distinction between these genres. On the other hand, this statement of Herrick's might be interpreted as implying that the later critics are less worth our study than had hitherto been supposed. Such an interpretation would be dangerous. Much of what is most characteristic of Renaissance criticism finds no place in these Horatian commentators. In the chapter on

Epic Poetry vs. Tragedy there is no mention of the romances, no discussion of the allowability of modern subjects and Christian machinery; in other words, no mention of the problems which really agitated the Renaissance when it considered the "long poem," the problems that Spenser and Milton had to consider before they could write the *Faerie Queene* and *Paradise Lost*.

Students of Renaissance criticism will be grateful to Herrick not only for showing how much of the spadework had been done by the lesser known commentators before the great critical treatises were published, but for shedding more light on the relations of the criticism of the Renaissance with that of Greece and Rome.

VERNON HALL, JR.

Dartmouth College

A Bibliography of the Theophrastian Character in English. By CHESTER NOYES GREENOUGH. Prepared for Publication by J. MILTON FRENCH. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1947. Pp. xii + 347. \$10.00.

The Theophrastian Character in England to 1642. By BENJAMIN BOYCE. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1947. Pp. ix + 324. \$5.00.

With the first volume, Miss Murphy's bibliography of the English character is vastly enlarged and extended both forward and backward in time. Professor Greenough found his earliest "characters" in 1495 and his latest in 1931; between these dates he uncovered them by the thousands and he has indicated their residence by arranging the titles in chronological order. Under the first listing, one finds an analysis of each book and all the necessary bibliographical impedimenta; additions and emendations are indicated at all subsequent chronological stops. The contents of Earle's "W. S. for Ed: Blount" edition are, for example, enumerated under 1628; the augmentations of the so-called "fift Edition" are mentioned under 1629. The volume is, consequently, bibliographically sound and it is made extraordinarily useful by subject, title, and author indexes.

Professor Boyce's book, which is based on Professor Greenough's notes, is a running commentary on the earlier part of the bibliography. There is first a survey of the "character" in ancient times and an account of the blending of that tradition with the native tradition which is older than Chaucer. Then there are pauses on the "character" according to Hall and Overbury and a good account of the theory and vogue of the "character" prior to the *Micro-cosmographie* of Earle. Boyce also discusses the use of the

"character" in sermons and suggests how widely spread the fashion became after Overbury's successful book. He gives ample illustrations and quotations that supplement Aldington's anthology which is now long out of print.

We are amazed to discover how wide this passion for "characters" became and how generously they were used. Preachers like Thomas Adams pop them into sermons; repentants like William Fennor drop them into autobiographies. Everyone seemed to try his hand, but only a few—Earle and Overbury—really succeed. By the middle of the seventeenth century, the "character" became a vehicle of political or ecclesiastical propaganda and controversy, and the number of "characters" of Quakers, Dissenters, Agitators, True Britons, etc. that fluttered from the presses makes dull the imagination. Behind some of these "characters," however, we feel the glow of reality, and it is not long until the "portrait character" (known best to literary students in the sketches of Clarendon or in the *Characters of the Royal Family* by Defoe) emerges. So by one course, the early "characters" of Hall, Overbury, and Earle lead to Steele, and Addison, and the novel, and by another way they are metamorphosed into interpretive biography.

It is unfortunate that Professor Greenough did not live to see his life's work in print; but he found excellent and modest helpers in Professors French and Boyce, who brought all of his material together, checked and revised it, and saw it through the press. No teacher could ask for a greater tribute. It is, of course, needless to add that Harvard Press has come up to its usual typographical excellence in the printing of both books.

D. C. A.

Jorge Guillén: Cántico. By JOAQUÍN CASALDUERO. Santiago de Chile: Cruz del Sur, 1946. Pp. 181.

Joaquín Casaldüero has produced another excellent book in his study of Jorge Guillén's *Cántico*, a penetrating and subtle analysis of the meaning and the form of the work of an original and truly creative contemporary poet. Guillén is a poet more renowned than read, more admired than understood. Casaldüero knows and understands *Cántico* as few people do. The passive reader seeking an easy guide to *Cántico*, however, will derive little from the present work, for Casaldüero the critic writes for the same public as Guillén the poet: he is as terse and exact in expression, as sure in his handling of abstractions; indeed there could not be a happier meeting of critic and poet. Casaldüero's method of criticism is so simple as to be extremely difficult and rare: he does not "interpret" a book, he merely endeavors to see and understand exactly what is in it, what the author intended to do, how and why and to what effect.

All his books of criticism have dealt with authors very conscious of their craft, rich in both content and form: Cervantes, Galdós, Bécquer, Guillén. Not only in his analyses of ideas and emotions and their relation to form, but in his syntheses, in his grasp of a work as a whole, do we observe his profound insight and his broad culture.

Jorge Guillén: Cántico, a deceptively short book, is divided into two parts, which correspond roughly to the first two editions of *Cántico*, 1928 and 1936 (the Mexican edition of 1945 had not been published when this book was written, but it loses none of its value thereby). Here Casaldueiro brings together in concisely logical exposition the ideas, concepts and attitudes dispersed throughout *Cántico*, emphasizing constantly Guillén's insistence on embracing reality in its totality with its essential unity, order, concreteness, simplicity, clarity; its "forma viva"; the apprehension of it by means of the senses; the poet's resultant delight in being; and his attitude of vigorous affirmation. He analyzes brilliantly and in detail the contribution of form and rhythm to the emotions expressed (notably in a masterly study of "Salvación de la Primavera," pp. 149-157 and 175-178). And he situates this poetry in its relation to that of preceding periods—especially Impressionism—and the opposite pole of contemporary poetry, Surrealism, to the other arts, and to the whole history of ideas.

Casaldueiro underlines consistently the aspects of Jorge Guillén and *Cántico* which set them apart from other poets and other poetry. He stresses the complete and conscious interdependence of form and content. He insists also on the warmth of emotion and expression of *Cántico*. And he stresses repeatedly the creative power of Jorge Guillén, his complete mastery over form (not as an end in itself but as a means of expression), his constant imposition of his will—through the medium of hard work—on his material, words, to create a poetry rich in spiritual and human as well as esthetic values. Casaldueiro does all this with an intelligence, warmth, logic and insight all too seldom found in a critic. His book is a fine tribute to a fine poet.

RUTH WHITTREDGE

Wellesley College

Shakespeare's Sonnets: Their Relation to His Life. By BARBARA A. MACKENZIE. Cape Town: Maskew Miller Limited, 1946. Pp. x + 82.

After a rather thoroughgoing new re-shuffling of the order of the sonnets as first printed in 1609, the author of this monograph finds that they tell a coherent story of the nature and development of Shakespeare's relationship with Southampton, with the "Dark

Lady," with three different "rival poets" (Barnabe Barnes, Nash, and Gervase Markham), and with various persons and incidents which affected his life and work during the probable period of his sonnet-writing (late 1591 or early 1592 to early summer of 1596). Only when the sonnets have been rearranged does the story become coherent; yet the necessary changes must be based upon considerations of "substance and sentiment" as well as of "style" (p. ix). Here, therefore, a certain circularity seems undeniable. But Dr. Mackenzie has been careful to assert that much of what she offers is "a conjectural, imaginative construction" (p. vii). She gives pivotal importance to the "upstart crow" passage in *Greenes Groatsworth of Wit*, finding not merely that the attack is reflected in a specific group of consecutive sonnets (71, 72, 111, 112, 29, and 37; autumn, 1592) but also that it had a deep and lasting influence on the poet and his art. In the sonnets here read as immediate reactions to Greene's attack, indeed, "the man Shakespeare comes alive" for Dr. Mackenzie: "here is no myth, no dramatic creation, but humanity in the living flesh" (p. 22); and the story, from this point onward is undeniably full, vivid, and original. But the Shakespeare who comes alive—here abjectly losing all confidence in his own poetic powers as a result of the publication of Greene's pamphlet, subsequently confused or lost in a whole series of absurdly school-girlish passions and petty fears and jealousies—is neither attractive nor entirely credible; nor does the story that Dr. Mackenzie tells seem consistent with her assertion that, in these poems, "we have to deal simply with a passionate friendship, unsullied by any taint of perversion" (p. x).

To insure the complete independence of her own findings, Dr. Mackenzie "sedulously and deliberately avoided consulting the conclusions reached by other recent critics in the field . . . such as Tucker Brooke and the late J. A. Fort" (p. v). Probably this policy also explains the absence of any mention whatever of the *New Variorum Sonnets*, edited by Hyder Rollins and published in 1944.

C. HINMAN

Minor Knickerbockers: Representative Selections, with Introduction, Bibliography, and Notes (AWS). By KENDALL B. TAFT. New York: American Book Co., 1947. Pp. cxlviii + 410. \$2.50.

Even though the major "Knickerbocker" writers (Irving, Cooper, and Bryant) are excluded from treatment in this volume, no other book contains such helpful and abundant information about the literary history of New York City during the very active period 1807-1837 as the 110-page "Introduction" to this anthology,

the twenty-fifth now available in the American Writers Series; and no readily accessible book contains such comprehensive bibliographical information on the subject as does the thirty-seven-page "Selected Bibliography" (annotated) here available. These features would thoroughly justify the book even if there were no edited selections.

During the period covered by *Minor Knickerbockers* (1807-1837) New York (with over 80,000 people at the beginning and over 300,000 at the end) was the self-conscious literary and publishing as well as commercial center of our young country. For a time after this period New England was to play the leading part in our national literature. Of the twenty-seven New York writers included in this anthology, fourteen are given reasonably extensive representation—such authors as Paulding, Woodworth, Halleck, Payne, Drake, and Willis. An attempt is made by the editor, both in the text and in the informative footnotes, to describe the social, political, economic, and cultural context of these twenty-seven writers. Fortunately, this purpose is greatly aided by frequent citations from contemporary memoirs, diaries (like that of Philip Hone), and periodical accounts, as well as condensed information from such comprehensive modern studies as Odell's *Annals of the New York Stage*. There may be a tendency, here and there, however, to take too readily at face value facts and figures from contemporary memoirs and periodicals, notably given to exaggeration, especially of circulation figures. These same sources, on the other hand, provide information for the best section of the "Introduction": that surveying literary criticism in periodicals during the period and emphasizing the unusual stress in New York on such values of literature as amusement, escape, information, and enjoyment of craftsmanship.

In spite of the long helpful "Introduction" to this volume, the literary history of early nineteenth-century New York remains to be written. With this scholarly essay and the theses, biographies, bibliographies, and indexes to periodical literature now available, the time should not be long off before we may expect such a cultural history.

HERMAN E. SPIVEY

University of Florida

BRIEF MENTION

James Russell Lowell. HARRY H. CLARK and NORMAN FOERSTER, eds. American Writers Series. New York: American Book Co., 1947. Pp. clxvi + 498. \$2.50. The only fair way to mention this volume—number 24 in the American Writers Series—is to say that it represents, perhaps, the culmination of a body of studies that is without

precedent in American Literature. The text selections, along with bibliographies and introductory comment, have already proved invaluable to professors in colleges which possess mediocre library facilities. They are of almost equal use as introductory texts on the graduate level. Professor Clark, as general editor, has kept them all to the exacting and special perspective which is probably the only one feasible in an undertaking as comprehensive as this: He has apparently insisted that the Introductions be primarily descriptive, rather than in any fundamental sense critical. The Introduction to the present book is divided into two broad segments. Mr. Clark discusses Lowell under three evolving phases: "The Humanitarian" "The Nationalist," and "The Natural Aristocrat." Mr. Foerster in his remarks on "Lowell as Critic," reprints Chapter III of his *American Criticism* (1928). I suppose this is all right, though a good many things have been said about Lowell in this latter role during the past twenty years. The fundamental contention of the editors is that what certain critics have termed "inconsistency" in Lowell "can be better defined as open-mindedness and the courage to modify attitudes which did not seem to him justified by the results." The question of moral responsibility in this connection is not examined, though what it implies, in the case of a semi-public character like Lowell, is rather terrifying to contemplate. Few students will quarrel, however, with the following comment: "A good case could be made out for Lowell . . . as the most completely representative spokesman of the New England Mind." The observation is true, with all that it may suggest. The selections from the author's writings have been chosen with uncommon discrimination.

RICHMOND CROOM BEATTY

Vanderbilt University

L'Orient romanesque en France 1704-1789. By MARIE-LOUISE DUFRENOY. Tome II, Bibliographie générale. Montréal: Éditions Beauchemin, 1947. Pp. 502. This is a companion volume to Miss Dufrenoy's interesting study which we reviewed in *MLN.*, LXI, 485. Miss Dufrenoy has divided her bibliography into three large sections: I. A bibliography of sources by which the "conteurs" and "romanciers orientaux" of the eighteenth century were inspired; II. A chronological bibliography of the works containing the "matière d'orient"; III. Reference works which she utilized in Vol. I, or previous studies that dealt with her material. The compilation is undoubtedly invaluable to every eighteenth century scholar. Her book would have further facilitated the work of the researcher had she adopted a geographical classification within her chronological classification, and had she included in the index the

names of the authors cited in Section III. Some of her selections seem capricious. Why the Carcassonne ed. of the *Lettres Persanes* and not Barckhausen's? Why is no mention made of Samsami's little book: *L'Iran dans la littérature française*? And why begin with travels as source material with the year 1600 and not with Pierre Belon's fascinating *Observations de plusieurs singularitez et choses mémorables trouvées en Grèce, Asie, Judée, Egypte, Arabie, et autres pays estranges* . . . 1553. It is not difficult to find lacunae in a work of such magnitude and I wish in no way to minimize the value of Miss Dufrenoy's painstaking effort for which all those interested in literary history and the history of ideas will be extremely grateful.

EMILE MALAKIS

The Johns Hopkins University

CORRESPONDENCE

FOOTNOTE ON CALDERÓN, RAVENSCROFT, AND BOURSALT. At the risk of boring the reader, I should like to point out certain misstatements or misinterpretations in Mr. Lancaster's reply¹ to my note¹ on the source of Ravenscroft's *Wrangling Lovers*, and, with my foot thus in the door, to add a comment or two of my own.

Mr. Lancaster states that my conclusions are based, in part, "on the fact that Boursault called his novel a 'Traduction Espagnole.'"² Examination of my note will reveal that, while Boursault's own statement is mentioned, it forms no part of the evidence on which my conclusions are based.

Mr. Lancaster states further that I have submitted "as evidence four cases in which . . . [I think] that details given in the Spanish novel have been preserved in three of Calderón's plays and by Ravenscroft, and not by Boursault."³ This statement is correct of only my first *three* cases; the fourth concerns details given in both Calderón, Ravenscroft, and Boursault.

It is true, as Mr. Lancaster has noted,⁴ that my hypothesis is based on a refusal to admit that the evidence I presented could be explained away as coincidence. Let us examine for a moment Mr. Lancaster's rebuttal for the theory of coincidence. He says, first of all, ". . . yet if I had space enough I could submit examples of coincidence, not borrowing, much more striking than these Mr. Rundle cites."⁵ I have heard this device used many times by schoolboys, who will often use mythical older brothers to bolster them in an altercation, but I was not aware that it had crept into the repertoire of either nineteenth or twentieth century literary scholars.

¹ *MLN* June, 1947, LXII, pp. 382-389.

² P. 385.

³ P. 386.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.* As far as space is concerned, Mr. Lancaster could have had plenty had he not gone off to tilt windmills. He takes up over half a page (pp.

Having discharged his blank cartridge, Mr. Lancaster now loads his gun with shot but, for some strange reason, imagines he brings down my game by shooting at right angles to it. His contention that my "entire hypothesis . . . depends upon the assumption that Ravenscroft did not imitate Boursault" is completely erroneous. Even had we proof positive that Ravenscroft was using Boursault,⁶ the similarities between Ravenscroft and Calderón would still point to a source used by both of the latter—in that case, to the Spanish novel as an *additional* source for Ravenscroft.

The entire matter of Ravenscroft's use of a Spanish novel does depend, then, on whether my evidence is to be regarded as coincidence. I doubt that so considering it would fare very well in the mathematics department. I don't know exactly what the odds against three such "coincidences" would be, but I'm sure the figures—like those concerning the Shakespearean sonnet, the monkeys, and the typewriter—would be too astronomical for mundane application.

Of course, as Mr. Lancaster re-dresses my points, they are considerably changed. Naturally, two fathers could, in separate works, think of writing letters—but my entire point was that both Calderón and Ravenscroft had

387-8) to prove that, in general, Ravenscroft is nearer to Boursault than to Calderón—a thing I would have no reason or occasion to deny, a thing quite beside any point I had made.

⁶ Mr. Lancaster's evidence for this (pp. 386-7) is interesting but not entirely convincing. (1) He assumes that the Spanish name would be Ordoño. Might it not have been Ordgano, as in Ravenscroft? Boursault's use of the name would then be as near the Spanish as is Ordgano to Ordgno. Moreover, why assume that Ravenscroft, who knew French, would need a French midwife for the letter *g*? (2) Benevent is a perfectly natural English shortening of Benevente. (3) The figure is not "sixty and fourteen ducates," as Mr. Lancaster represents it, but "twenty seven thousand, nine hundred sixty and fourteen ducates"—a different matter. Ravenscroft's shop-keeper, who rolls out this sum, is impressed by it and wishes to impress Gusman. Ravenscroft, though not the best playwright of the period, certainly knew that the sum of sixty and fourteen is seventy-four. Obviously, he kept the circumlocution only for effect. Might not the Spanish novelist have been contriving the same effect by a device which is no more foreign to his language than to English? (4) As for the "*adieu Jusqu' au revoir*," I cannot understand the logic of Mr. Lancaster's comment, "one can hardly suppose that the Spanish novelist dropped into French at this point." Quite obviously, there could have been short French (or Italian) passages scattered *throughout* the Spanish novel, any one of which in Ravenscroft's retention would have seemed a transcription from Boursault. (5) I do not care to hazard a guess as to whether or not an unknown Spaniard would dare refer to the Inquisition in a comic passage; Mr. Lancaster's comment does suggest an interesting possible reason for the novel's disappearance.

them writing at *exactly* the same point in *exactly* the same story—and that is an entirely different matter. So, also, it *might* occur to Ravenscroft to have Diego stay Sanco until he had read a letter; but Mr. Lancaster conveniently forgets⁷ that almost exactly the same words are used at this point by Calderón and Ravenscroft. And so on. In summing my points, Mr. Lancaster has used a sort of reverse alchemy, an art upon which scientists have long frowned.

Indeed, should I follow Mr. Lancaster's advice to emulate Mandoce and search for the lost Señorita Novela, I believe I should prefer that Mr. Lancaster not accompany me. I fear that, should we find the lady, he might, before I could speak to her, declare her to be not Señorita Novela at all but her French cousin, Mademoiselle Nouvelle, and send her home to write letters in a cool closet. So once again I would be shipwrecked—by a coincidence.

J. U. RUNDLE

Indiana University

REPLY. I regret that I made Mr. Rundle's case less feeble than it really is. I assumed that he was following Langbaine, whose reason for holding that Ravenscroft imitated a Spanish novel was that an English translation of Boursault, which he did not recognize as such, is called a "Pleasant Spanish History Faithfully Translated."¹ Mr. Rundle now makes it clear that he is relying purely on the slight resemblances he has discovered between Calderón and Ravenscroft. These appear striking to him because they occur at "exactly the same point in exactly the same story." Unfortunately the stories told by the Englishman and the Spaniard are not exactly the same, and Ravenscroft's version is much nearer to Boursault's than it is to Calderón's. It means little that in Ravenscroft and Calderón a man tells a valet to wait till he has read a letter and a girl declares that her father is in the habit of writing in a room, since the situations, the persons, the letter, and the room are all in Boursault's novel. Yet it is on this slight evidence that Mr. Rundle would have us believe that a Spanish novel was important enough to be imitated by Calderón, Boursault, and Ravenscroft, though it is now unknown even by name; and the still more astonishing hypothesis that traces of the lost Spanish novel are better preserved in the English version than in the French, in Boursault's novel than in plays by Calderón!

I regard his findings as coincidences, but, if I considered them otherwise, I would take them as evidence that Ravenscroft imitated Calderón in addition to Boursault. This supposition is, however, rejected by Mr. Rundle. He clings to Langbaine's theory of the Spanish novel, though he fails to use what Langbaine submitted as evidence and though he offers

⁷ P. 386.

¹ My other statement, incorrect though to my opponent's advantage, could not have misled the reader, for I quoted the passages from Calderón and Ravenscroft on the same page (386), a fact that Mr. Rundle fails to mention.

nothing to show that the mysterious source was a novel rather than a play, or even that it was written in Spanish.

In his fifth note he holds that, in devoting half a page to showing that Ravenscroft is nearer to Boursault than he is to Calderón, I was "tilting at windmills," but this was a quite necessary part of my refutation. As a matter of fact I was tilting at Mr. Rundle. If he wishes to identify himself with a windmill, I will not protest.

In his sixth note he supposes that his unknown novelist called a valet Ordgano. Can he find such a name anywhere in Spanish literature? I think not. It is much more easily understood as a misspelling of Boursault's Ordogno. The Spanish name is not Benevente, as Mr. Rundle gives it, but Benavente. In Ravenscroft's play it is Benevent, exactly the spelling employed by Boursault. "Twenty-seven thousand, nine hundred sixty and fourteen ducates," with the final emphasis on the small number fourteen, is not, as Mr. Rundle supposes, a stronger expression than "Twenty-seven thousand, nine hundred and seventy-four." It is obvious that Ravenscroft is translating Boursault's "vingt-sept mille neuf cens soixante & quatorze." However, the whole note is beside the point as Mr. Rundle is now willing to admit the possibility that Ravenscroft used Boursault in addition to the lost novel.

Mr. Rundle implies that I was bluffing when I said I could give more striking examples of coincidence than those he refuses to admit as such. Here is one that far surpasses those concerned with the letter and the writing-room. Brieux's *Berceau* treats the subject of marital difficulties that arise when a woman has had a child by her first husband, has divorced him, has remarried, and has had no child by the second. So does Hervieu's *Dédale*. In both plays contact is reestablished between the heroine and her first husband by the illness of their child. In both plays the heroine was originally named Laurence. Hervieu had a character named Virieu; Brieux, one named Girieu. Brieux's play was completed before the other and was being rehearsed when Hervieu first told the director of the Comédie Française about his own play. Hervieu had previously known nothing about the rival production. It was Brieux who gave me this information, although it would have been to his advantage to appear to have been imitated by Hervieu, who was obliged to change his heroine's name and to make other alterations in order to prevent persons with the outlook of Mr. Rundle from accusing him of plagiarism.

In return for my comparing Mr. Rundle's pursuit of a nameless Spanish novel with a valet's search for a nameless Spanish lady, he becomes quite playful and insinuates that I have been influenced in this discussion by the fact that my field is French, but this insinuation is most unjust, for I trace the whole business back to Calderón, while Mr. Rundle deprives the Spanish dramatist of this distinction.

In conclusion I must apologize to the readers of *MLN* for devoting so much space to this subject. I can offer as an excuse for publishing Mr. Rundle's articles only the fact that they were directed against myself.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

Funk & Wagnalls Company

invites you to send for an examination
copy on approval of the

NEW COLLEGE STANDARD DICTIONARY

EM'·PHA·TYPE *Edition*

so that you can make these simple tests:

- 1 Choose any five words, look them up in the New College Standard Dictionary—Emphatye Edition, and compare the definitions with those given in any other college grade dictionary.
- 2 Choose some word that is frequently mispronounced and compare the method of indicating pronunciation in the New College Standard Dictionary—Emphatye Edition with the method of any other dictionary.
- 3 Choose some hyphenated word and see how the hyphenation is indicated in the New College Standard Dictionary—Emphatye Edition.
- 4 Compare the legibility of type-page in the New College Standard Dictionary—Emphatye Edition with that of any other college grade dictionary.
- 5 Choose some new words in any technical field and see how many of them are included in the New College Standard Dictionary—Emphatye Edition.

Just Published!

FUNK & WAGNALLS STANDARD HANDBOOK OF SYNONYMS, ANTONYMS AND PREPOSITIONS

Edited by James C. Fernald, in a completely revised edition by the Funk & Wagnalls editorial staff, \$3.00

More than 8,000 synonyms classified and discriminated, 4,000 antonyms, correct use of prepositions. INDEX for Synonyms. INDEX for Antonyms.

More than 100 colleges and universities have already sent us quantity orders for this new dictionary. We ask you to make a test of its special features in the hope that you too will wish to recommend this modern dictionary to your students.

- 145,000 entries
- 5,000 new words
- 1,000 illustrations
- \$5.50 plain
- \$6.00 with thumb index

FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY

153 EAST 24TH STREET

NEW YORK 10, NEW YORK

PARADISE REGAINED

THE TRADITION AND THE POEM

BY

ELIZABETH MARIE POPE

Criticism of *Paradise Regained* has so far seldom taken into account the standard theological views of Christ's temptation current in Milton's day. No systematic attempt has been made to determine how far they influence or explain the poem. But as the background and starting-place for any contemporary treatment of the subject, they are indispensable if the modern reader is to see the temptation in the same terms that the poet and his audience did.

The first aim of the present study is therefore to sum up the conventional teaching on such major points as the exact degree to which Christ's temptations resembled Adam's; what sins Satan urged him to commit and how they corresponded to those of the flesh, world, and devil; the reasons why Satan undertook the trial or God permitted it; and the extent to which Christ acted throughout simply and entirely as a human being. Milton's handling of each theme is then set against that of the tradition, to show what he accepted and what he modified because of personal beliefs or literary exigencies. The new evidence not only makes it possible to study the way his mind dealt with his materials but sheds light on many disputed questions like his reasons for including the banqueting scene and the storm scene, the exact significance he attached to each temptation; his characterization of Christ; and his religious position in 1671.

xvi + 135 pages; 9 plates; cloth, \$2.25.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS : BALTIMORE 18, MD.

Selections from
the writings of the
"South American
Benjamin Franklin"

A SARMIENTO ANTHOLOGY

Translated By STUART E. GRUMMON

Edited by ALLISON W. BUNKLEY

DOMINGO FAUSTINO SARMIENTO, 19th century titan, was President of Argentina, champion of the progressive political forces, educator, diplomat, economist, and leader of the Romantic school of writing. The selections in this anthology have been chosen from his most important works. Included are parts of "Provincial Recollections"; excerpts revealing his thoughts on journalism, education, and politics; his delightful observations on his travels in the United States; and parts of *Pacundo*, generally considered the most important book written in Latin America.

342 pages, \$5.00

At your bookstore,
PRINCETON University Press
Princeton, N. J.



BY FRANÇOIS DENOEU
DARTMOUTH COLLEGE

The revision of this unique "Miroir" will be ready for next fall's classes in intermediate French — or possibly even for summer school classes. This will be welcome news to all who are devoted to the present edition and to others who feel that the ideal text on French civilization should carry the narrative through World War II to the most recent point possible in the development of French affairs.

*Petit Miroir
de la
civilisation
française*

REVISED

D. C. HEATH
AND COMPANY



ENGLISH PROSODY AND
MODERN POETRY

BY
KARL SHAPIRO

This was the Annual Tudor and Stuart Lecture delivered on April 18, 1947 and is reprinted from *ELH, A Journal of English Literary History*, Volume Fourteen, Number Two, June, 1947.

iv + 16 pages. Price 50 cents.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS · BALTIMORE 18, MARYLAND